CTP-TAMU-61/96
hep-th/9611203

SUPERMEMBRANES[1]

M. J. Duff[2]

Center for Theoretical Physics
Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843

arXiv:hep-th/9611203v2 1 Dec 1996

ABSTRACT

We give an elementary introduction to the theory of supermembranes.

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF ABDUS SALAM

[1]Based on lectures given at the T. A. S. I. Summer School, University of Colorado, Boulder, June 1996; the Topical Meeting, Imperial College, London, July 1996 and the 26th British Universities Summer School in Theoretical Elementary Particle Physics, University of Swansea, September 1996.

[2]Research supported in part by NSF Grant PHY-9411543.

Contents

1 Supermembranes **2**

1.1 Bosonic p-branes 4

1.2 Super p-branes 7

1.3 The brane scan 9

1.4 String/fivebrane duality in $D = 10$? 11

1.5 Type IIA superstring in $D = 10$ from supermembrane in $D = 11$ 12

1.6 The signature of spacetime 14

1.7 Twelve dimensions? 22

1.8 Type II p-branes: the brane scan revisited 23

2 Aspects of quantization **28**

2.1 The lightcone gauge: area-preserving diffeomorphisms 28

2.2 Massless states and anomalies 30

3 P-Branes as Solitons **32**

3.1 The elementary string 35

3.2 The solitonic fivebrane 40

3.3 Type II solutions, D-branes and black branes 41

3.4 Membranes and fivebranes in $D = 11$ 45

4 Duality **48**

4.1 String/fivebrane duality: good news and bad 48

4.2 String/string duality in $D = 6$ 51

5 Electric/Magnetic Duality from String/String Duality **54**

5.1 S duality and T duality 54

5.2 Duality of dualities 55

6 String/String Duality from M Theory **59**

6.1 Membrane/fivebrane duality in $D = 11$ 61

6.2 Four dimensions 64

1 Supermembranes

Membrane theory has a strange history which goes back even further than strings. The idea that the elementary particles might correspond to modes of a vibrating membrane was put forward originally in 1962 by Dirac [1]. When string theory came along in the 1970s, there were some attempts to revive the membrane idea but without much success. Things did not change much until 1986 when Hughes, Liu and Polchinski [2] showed that it was possible to combine membranes with supersymmetry: the *supermembrane* was born.

Consequently, while all the progress in string theory was going on, a small splinter group was posing the question: Once you have given up 0-dimensional particles in favor of 1-dimensional strings, why not 2-dimensional membranes or in general p-dimensional objects (inevitably dubbed *p-branes*)? Just as a 0-dimensional particle sweeps out a 1-dimensional *worldline* as it evolves in time, so a 1-dimensional string sweeps out a 2-dimensional *world-sheet* and a p-brane sweeps out a d-dimensional *worldvolume*, where $d = p + 1$. Of course, there must be enough room for the p-brane to move about in spacetime, so d must be less than or equal to the number of spacetime dimensions D. In fact, as we shall see in section (1.3) supersymmetry places further severe restrictions both on the dimension of the extended object and the dimension of spacetime in which it lives [10]. One can represent these as points on a graph where we plot spacetime dimension D vertically and the p-brane dimension $d = p + 1$ horizontally. This graph is called the *brane scan*. See Table 1. In the early eighties Green and Schwarz [4] had shown that spacetime supersymmetry allows classical superstrings moving in spacetime dimensions $3, 4, 6$ and 10. (Quantum considerations rule out all but the ten-dimensional case as being truly fundamental. Of course some of these ten dimensions could be curled up to a very tiny size in the way suggested by Kaluza and Klein [5, 6]. Ideally six would be compactified in this way so as to yield the four spacetime dimensions with which we are familiar.) It was now realized, however, that these 1-branes in $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 should now be viewed as but special cases of this more general class of supersymmetric extended object.

Curiously enough, the maximum spacetime dimension permitted is eleven, where Bergshoeff, Sezgin and Townsend found their supermembrane [3, 7] which couples to eleven-dimensional supergravity [8, 5]. (The 3-form gauge field of $D = 11$ supergravity had long been suggestive of a membrane interpretation [9]). Moreover, it was then possible to show [11] by simul-

Table 1: The brane scan, where S, V and T denote scalar, vector and antisymmetric tensor multiplets.

$D\uparrow$													
11	.			S			T				?		
10	.	V	S/V	V	V	V	S/V	V	V	V	V		
9	.	S				S							
8	.				S								
7	.			S			T						
6	.	V	S/V	V	S/V	V	V						
5	.	S		S									
4	.	V	S/V	S/V	V								
3	.	S/V	S/V	V									
2	.	S											
1	.												
0	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	$d\rightarrow$

taneous dimensional reduction of the spacetime and worldvolume that the membrane looks like a string in ten dimensions. In fact, it yields precisely the Type IIA superstring. This suggested that the eleven-dimensional theory was perhaps the more fundamental after all.

Notwithstanding these and subsequent results, the supermembrane enterprise was, until recently, largely ignored by the mainstream physics community. Those who had worked on eleven-dimensional supergravity and then on supermembranes spent the early eighties arguing for *spacetime* dimensions greater than four, and the late eighties and early nineties arguing for *worldvolume* dimensions greater than two. The latter struggle was by far the more bitter!

In these lectures we shall review the progress reached over the last decade and see how it fits in with recent results in string duality, D-branes [12] and M-theory [11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21]. I shall draw on material contained in previous reviews on supermembranes [24, 25, 26, 27], duality [28] and M-theory [29]. The reader is also referred to the reviews by Townsend on supermembranes [30] by Polchinski on D-branes [31] and by Schwarz [32] on M-theory.

1.1 Bosonic p-branes

Consider some extended object with 1 time and $(d-1)$ space dimensions moving in a spacetime with 1 time and $(D-1)$ space dimensions. We shall demand that its dynamics is governed by minimizing the worldvolume which the object sweeps out

$$S = -T_d \int d^d\xi \ \{-det\partial_i x^\mu \ \partial_j x^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}\}^{1/2} \tag{1.1}$$

where we have introduced worldvolume coordinates ξ^i (i = 0, ..., (d-1)) and spacetime coordinates x^μ ($\mu = 0, \ldots,$ (D-1)). To begin with, we assume spacetime is flat with Minkowski metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ and signature $(-,+,\ldots,+)$. The tension of the object is given by the constant T_d which renders the action S dimensionless. This action was first introduced by Dirac [1] in the case of a membrane ($d = 3$) and later by Nambu [33] and Goto [34] in the case of a string ($d = 2$).

The classical equations of motion that follow from (1.1) may equivalently be obtained from the action

$$S = T_d \int d^d\xi \Big(-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_i x^\mu \partial_j x^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}(d-2)\sqrt{-}\gamma \Big) \tag{1.2}$$

where, following Howe and Tucker [35] and Polyakov [36], we have introduced the auxiliary field $\gamma_{ij}(\xi)$. γ denotes its determinant and γ^{ij} its inverse. Varying with respect to γ_{ij} yields the equation of motion

$$\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\gamma^{k\ell}\partial_k x^\mu \partial_\ell x^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} - \sqrt{-\gamma}\partial_k x^\mu \partial_\ell x^\nu \gamma^{ik}\gamma^{j\ell} = \frac{1}{2}(d-2)\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij} \quad . \tag{1.3}$$

Taking the trace, we find for $d \neq 2$, that

$$\gamma^{k\ell}\partial_k x^\mu \partial_\ell x^\nu \ \eta_{\mu\nu} = d \tag{1.4}$$

and hence that γ_{ij} is just the induced metric on worldvolume

$$\gamma_{ij} = \partial_i x^\mu \partial_j x^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}. \tag{1.5}$$

Varying (1.2) with respect to x^μ yields

$$\partial_i \left(\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_j x^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}\right) = 0. \tag{1.6}$$

Thus equations (1.5) and (1.6) are together equivalent to the equation of motion obtained by varying (1.1) with respect to x^μ.

Note that the case $d = 2$ is special. Here, the worldvolume cosmological term drops out and (1.2) displays a conformal symmetry

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{ij}(\xi) &\to \Omega^2(\xi)\gamma_{ij}(\xi) \\ x^\mu(\xi) &\to x^\mu(\xi) \end{aligned} \tag{1.7}$$

where Ω is some arbitrary function of ξ. In this case γ_{ij} and $\partial_i x^\mu \partial_j x^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}$ are related only up to a conformal factor. The actions (1.1) and (1.2) are, however, equivalent for all d, at least classically. As discussed in [37], it is possible to construct a conformally invariant action for all d, by the simple expedient of raising the usual Lagrangian to the power $d/2$

$$S = -T_d \int d^d\xi \sqrt{-\gamma}\left(\frac{1}{d}\gamma^{ij}\partial_i x^\mu \partial_j x^\nu \partial_j x^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}\right)^{d/2} \quad . \tag{1.8}$$

The equations of motion read

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\left(\frac{1}{d}\gamma^{k\ell}\partial_k x^\mu \partial_\ell x^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}\right)^{d/2} \\ &\qquad = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{d}\gamma^{k\ell}\partial_k x^\mu \partial_\ell x^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}\right)^{d/2-1} \gamma^{im}\gamma^{jn}\partial_m x^\rho \partial_n x^\sigma \eta_{\rho\sigma} \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

and

$$\partial_i \left[\sqrt{-\gamma} \left(\gamma^{k\ell} \partial_i x^\mu \partial_j x^\sigma \eta_{\rho\sigma} \right)^{d/2-1} \gamma^{ij} \partial_j x^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} \right] = 0 \tag{1.10}$$

which are again equivalent to the Dirac and Howe-Tucker equations of motion.

There are two useful generalizations of the above. The first is to go to curved space by replacing $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ by $g_{\mu\nu}(x)$; the second is to introduce an antisymmetric tensor field $B_{\mu\nu\ldots\rho}(x)$ of rank d which couples via a Wess-Zumino term. The action (1.2) then becomes

$$S = T_d \int d^d\xi \Big[-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_i x^\mu \partial_j x^\mu g_{\mu\nu}(x) + \frac{1}{2}(d-2)\sqrt{-\gamma} \\ + \frac{1}{d!}\epsilon^{i_1 i_2 .. i_d} \partial_{i_1} x^{\mu_1} \partial_{i_2} x^{\mu_2} \ldots \partial_{i_d} x^{\mu_d} B_{\mu_1\mu_2..\mu_d}(x) \Big] \tag{1.11}$$

and the equations of motion are

$$\partial_i \left(\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_j x^\nu g_{\mu\nu} \right) + g_{\mu\rho}\Gamma^\rho{}_{\kappa\lambda}\partial_i x^\kappa \partial_j x^\lambda \gamma^{ij} \\ = \frac{1}{d!} F_{\mu\nu\tau\cdots\sigma} \epsilon^{ij\cdots k} \partial_i x^\nu \partial_j x^\tau \ldots \partial_k x^\sigma \tag{1.12}$$

and

$$\gamma_{ij} = \partial_i x^\mu \partial_j x^\nu g_{\mu\nu}(x) \tag{1.13}$$

where the field-strength F is given by

$$F = dB \tag{1.14}$$

and hence obeys the Bianchi identity

$$dF = 0. \tag{1.15}$$

The virtue of these generalizations is that they now permit a straightforward transition to the supermembrane.

Our experience with string theory suggests that there are two ways of introducing supersymmetry into membrane theory. The first is to look for a *supermembrane* for which has manifest spacetime supersymmetry but no supersymmetry on the worldvolume. The second is to look for a *spinning membrane* which has manifest worldvolume supersymmetry but no supersymmetry in spacetime. An early attempt at spinnning membranes by Howe and Tucker [35] encountered the problem that the worldvolume cosmological term does not permit a supersymmetrization using the usual rules of $d = 3$ tensor calculus without the introduction of an Einstein-Hilbert term [39]. Indeed, these objections have been elevated

to the status of a *no-go theorem* for spinning membranes [38]. An attempt to circumvent this no-go theorem was made by Lindstrom and Rocek [40] starting from the conformally invariant action (1.8), but is is fair to say that the spinning membrane approach never really caught on. Recently, there has been some success in formalisms with both worldvolume and spacetime supersymmetry [41, 42]. The last ten years of supermembranes, however, has been dominated by the approach with spacetime supersymmetry and worldvolume kappa symmetry. At first, progress in supermembranes was hampered by the belief that kappa symmetry, so crucial to Green-Schwarz superparticles ($d = 1$) [43] and superstrings ($d = 2$) [4] could not be generalized to membranes. The breakthrough came when Hughes, Liu and Polchinski [2] showed that it could.

1.2 Super p-branes

It is ironic that although one of the motivations for the original supermembrane paper [2] was precisely to find the superthreebrane as a *topological defect* of a supersymmetric field theory in $D = 6$; the discovery of the other supermembranes proceeded in the opposite direction. Hughes et al. showed that kappa symmetry could be generalized to $d > 2$ and proceeded to construct a threebrane displaying an explicit $D = 6, N = 1$ spacetime supersymmetry and kappa invariance on the worldvolume. It was these kappa symmetric Green-Schwarz actions, rather then the soliton interpretation which was to dominate the early work on the subject. First of all, Bergshoeff, Sezgin and Townsend [3] found corresponding Green-Schwarz actions for other values of d and D, in particular the eleven-dimensional supermembrane. (We shall discuss the $D = 11$ supermembrane in section (1.5) and show how to derive from it the Type IIA string in ten dimensions by a simultaneous dimensional reduction of the worldvolume and the spacetime.) Their method was to show that such Green-Schwarz super p-brane actions are possible whenever there is a closed $(p + 2)$-form in superspace. As described in section (1.3), the four "fundamental" super p-branes are then given by $p = 2$ in $D = 11$, $p = 5$ in $D = 10$, $p = 3$ in $D = 6$ and $p = 2$ in $D = 4$ [10]. In fact, applying the above mentioned simultaneous reduction k times, we find four sequences of $(p-k)$-branes in $(D-k)$ dimensions, which include the well known Green-Schwarz superstrings in $D = 10, 6, 4$ and 3. These four sequences, known as the octonionic ($\mathcal{O}$), quaternionic ($\mathcal{H}$), complex ($\mathcal{C}$) and real ($\mathcal{R}$) sequences are desribed by the points labelled S on the brane scan of Table 1.

Let us introduce the coordinates Z^M of a curved superspace

$$Z^M = (x^\mu, \theta^\alpha) \tag{1.16}$$

and the supervielbein $E_M{}^A(Z)$ where $M = \mu, \alpha$ are world indices and $A = a, \alpha$ are tangent space indices. We also define the pull-back

$$E_i{}^A = \partial_i Z^M E_M{}^A \quad . \tag{1.17}$$

We also need the super-d-form $B_{A_d \ldots A_1}(Z)$. Then the supermembrane action is

$$\begin{aligned} S = T_d \int d^d\xi \Big[\quad & - \quad \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-}\gamma\gamma^{ij} E_i{}^a E_j{}^b \eta_{ab} + \frac{1}{2}(d-2)\sqrt{-}\gamma \\ & + \quad \frac{1}{d!}\epsilon^{i_1 \ldots i_d} E_{i_1}{}^{A_1} \cdots E_{i_d}{}^{A_d} B_{A_d \ldots A_1} \Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{1.18}$$

As in (1.11) there is a kinetic term, a worldvolume cosmological term, and a Wess-Zumino term. The action (1.18) has the virtue that it reduces to the Green-Schwarz superstring action when $d = 2$.

The target-space symmetries are superdiffeomorphisms, Lorentz invariance and d-form gauge invariance. The worldvolume symmetries are ordinary diffeomorphisms and kappa invariance referred to earlier which is known to be crucial for superstrings, so let us examine it in more detail. The transformation rules are

$$\delta Z^M E^a{}_M = 0, \quad \delta Z^M E^\alpha{}_M = \kappa^\beta (1+\Gamma)^\alpha{}_\beta \tag{1.19}$$

where $\kappa^\beta(\xi)$ is an anticommuting spacetime spinor but worldvolume scalar, and where

$$\Gamma^\alpha{}_\beta = \frac{(-1)^{d(d-3)/4}}{d!\sqrt{-}\gamma} \epsilon^{i_1 \ldots i_d} E_{i_1}{}^{a_1} E_{i_2}{}^{a_2} \ldots E_{i_d}{}^{a_d} \Gamma_{a_1 \ldots a_d} \quad . \tag{1.20}$$

Here Γ_a are the Dirac matrices in spacetime and

$$\Gamma_{a_1 \ldots a_d} = \Gamma_{[a_1 \cdots a_d]} \quad . \tag{1.21}$$

This kappa symmetry has the following important consequences:

1) The symmetry is achieved only if certain constraints on the antisymmetric tensor field strength $F_{MNP \ldots Q}$(Z) and the supertorsion are satisfied. In particular the Bianchi identity $dF = 0$ then requires the Γ matrix identity

$$\Big(d\bar{\theta}\Gamma_a d\theta\Big)\Big(d\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{ab_1 \ldots b_{d-2}} d\theta\Big) \quad = 0 \tag{1.22}$$

for a commuting spinor dθ. As shown by Achucarro, Evans, Townsend and Wiltshire [10] this is satisfied only for certain values of d and D. Specifically, for $d \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} d &= 2: \quad D = 3, 4, 6, 10 \\ d &= 3: \quad D = 4, 5, 7, 11 \\ d &= 4: \quad D = 6, 8 \\ d &= 5: \quad D = 9 \\ d &= 6: \quad D = 10 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{1.23}$$

Note that we recover as a special case the well-known result that Green-Schwarz superstrings exist *classically* only for $D = 3, 4, 6$, and 10. Note also $d_{max} = 6$ and $D_{max} = 11$. The upper limit of $D = 11$ is already known in supergravity but there it is necessary to make extra assumptions concerning the absence of consistent higher spin interactions. In supermembrane theory, it follows automatically. See, however, section (1.7).

2) The matrix Γ of (1.20) is traceless and satisfies

$$\Gamma^2 = 1 \tag{1.24}$$

when the equations of motion are satisfied and hence the matrices $(1 \pm \Gamma)/2$ act as projection operators. The transformation rule (1.19) therefore permits us to gauge away one half on the fermion degrees of freedom. As desribed below, this gives rise to a matching of physical boson and fermion degrees of freedom on the worldvolume.

3) In the case of the eleven-dimensional supermembrane, it has been shown [16] that the constraints on the background fields $E_M{}^A$ and B_{MNP} are nothing but the equations of motion of eleven-dimensional supergravity [3, 7].

1.3 The brane scan

The matching of physical bose and fermi degrees of freedom on the *worldvolume* may, at first sight, seem puzzling since we began with only spacetime supersymmetry. The explanation is as follows. As the p-brane moves through spacetime, its trajectory is described by the functions $X^M(\xi)$ where X^M are the spacetime coordinates ($M = 0, 1, \ldots, D-1$) and ξ^i are the worldvolume coordinates ($i = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1$). It is often convenient to make the so-called

static gauge choice by making the $D = d + (D - d)$ split

$$X^M(\xi) = (X^\mu(\xi), Y^m(\xi)), \tag{1.25}$$

where $\mu = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1$ and $m = d, \ldots, D-1$, and then setting

$$X^\mu(\xi) = \xi^\mu. \tag{1.26}$$

Thus the only physical worldvolume degrees of freedom are given by the $(D-d)$ $Y^m(\xi)$. So the number of on-shell bosonic degrees of freedom is

$$N_B = D - d. \tag{1.27}$$

To describe the super p-brane we augment the D bosonic coordinates $X^M(\xi)$ with anticommuting fermionic coordinates $\theta^\alpha(\xi)$. Depending on D, this spinor could be Dirac, Weyl, Majorana or Majorana-Weyl. The fermionic kappa symmetry means that half of the spinor degrees of freedom are redundant and may be eliminated by a physical gauge choice. The net result is that the theory exhibits a *d-dimensional worldvolume supersymmetry* [10] where the number of fermionic generators is exactly half of the generators in the original spacetime supersymmetry. This partial breaking of supersymmetry is a key idea. Let M be the number of real components of the minimal spinor and N the number of supersymmetries in D spacetime dimensions and let m and n be the corresponding quantities in d worldvolume dimensions. Let us first consider $d > 2$. Since kappa symmetry always halves the number of fermionic degrees of freedom and going on-shell halves it again, the number of on-shell fermionic degrees of freedom is

$$N_F = \frac{1}{2}mn = \frac{1}{4}MN. \tag{1.28}$$

Worldvolume supersymmetry demands $N_B = N_F$ and hence

$$D - d = \frac{1}{2}mn = \frac{1}{4}MN. \tag{1.29}$$

A list of dimensions, number of real dimensions of the minimal spinor and possible supersymmetries is given in Table 2, from which we see that there are only 8 solutions of (1.29) all with $N = 1$, as shown in Table 1. We note in particular that $D_{\max} = 11$ since $M \geq 64$ for $D \geq 12$ and hence (1.29) cannot be satisfied. Similarly $d_{\max} = 6$ since $m \geq 16$ for $d \geq 7$. The case $d = 2$ is special because of the ability to treat left and right moving modes

independently. If we require the sum of both left and right moving bosons and fermions to be equal, then we again find the condition (1.29). This provides a further 4 solutions all with $N = 2$, corresponding to Type II superstrings in $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 (or 8 solutions in all if we treat Type IIA and Type IIB separately). Both the gauge-fixed Type IIA and Type IIB superstrings will display $(8, 8)$ supersymmetry on the worldsheet. If we require only left (or right) matching, then (1.29) replaced by

$$D - 2 = n = \frac{1}{2}MN, \tag{1.30}$$

which allows another 4 solutions in $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10, all with $N = 1$. The gauge-fixed theory will display $(8, 0)$ worldsheet supersymmetry. The heterotic string falls into this category. The results [10] are indicated by the points labelled S in Table 1. Point particles with $d = 1$ are usually omitted from the brane scan [10, 72, 27], but in Table 1 we have included them.

An equivalent way to arrive at the above conclusions is to list all scalar supermultiplets and to interpret the dimension of the target space, D, by

$$D - d = \text{ number of scalars.} \tag{1.31}$$

A useful reference is [46] which provides an exhaustive classification of all unitary representations of supersymmetry with maximum spin 2. In particular, we can understand $d_{\max} = 6$ from this point of view since this is the upper limit for scalar supermultiplets. In summary, according to the above classification, Type II p-branes do not exist for $p > 1$. We shall return to this issue, however, in section (1.8).

There are four types of solution with $8 + 8$, $4 + 4$, $2 + 2$ or $1 + 1$ degrees of freedom respectively. Since the numbers 1, 2, 4 and 8 are also the dimension of the four division algebras, these four types of solution are referred to as real, complex, quaternion and octonion respectively. The connection with the division algebras can in fact be made more precise [44, 45].

1.4 String/fivebrane duality in $D = 10$?

Of particular interest was the $D = 10$ fivebrane, whose Wess-Zumino term coupled to a rank six antisymmetric tensor potential A_{MNPQRS} just as the Wess-Zumino term of the string coupled to a rank two potential B_{MN}. Spacetime supersymmetry therefore demanded that

Table 2: Minimal spinor components and supersymmetries.

Dimension (D or d)	Minimal Spinor (M or m)	Supersymmetry (N or n)
11	32	1
10	16	2, 1
9	16	2, 1
8	16	2, 1
7	16	2, 1
6	8	4, 3, 2, 1
5	8	4, 3, 2, 1
4	4	8, ..., 1
3	2	16, ..., 1
2	1	32, ..., 1

the fivebrane coupled to the 7-form field strength formulation of $D = 10$ supergravity [58] just as the string coupled to the 3-form version [59, 60]. These dual formulations of $D = 10$ supergravity have long been something of an enigma from the point of view of superstrings. As field theories, each seems equally valid. In particular, provided we couple them to $E_8 \times E_8$ or $SO(32)$ super-Yang-Mills [4], then both are anomaly free [62, 61]. Since the 3-form version corresponds to the field theory limit of the heterotic string, it was conjectured [24] that there ought to exist a *heterotic fivebrane* which could be viewed as a fundamental anomaly-free theory in its own right and whose field theory limit corresponds to the dual 7-form version. We shall refer to this as the *string/fivebrane duality conjecture*. At this stage, however, the solitonic element had not yet been introduced.

1.5 Type IIA superstring in $D = 10$ from supermembrane in $D = 11$

We begin with the bosonic sector of the $d = 3$ worldvolume of the $D = 11$ supermembrane:

$$\begin{aligned} S_3 &= T_3 \int d^3\xi \Big[-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N G_{MN}(X) + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{3!}\epsilon^{ijk}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N \partial_k X^P C_{MNP}(X) \Big] , \end{aligned} \tag{1.32}$$

where T_3 is the membrane tension, ξ^i $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ are the worldvolume coordinates, γ^{ij} is the worldvolume metric and $X^M(\xi)$ are the spacetime coordinates $(M = 0, 1, \ldots, 10)$. Kappa symmetry [3, 7] then demands that the background metric G_{MN} and background 3-form potential C_{MNP} obey the classical field equations of $D = 11$ supergravity, whose bosonic action is

$$I_{11} = \frac{1}{2{\kappa_{11}}^2} \int d^{11}x \sqrt{-G} \left[R_G - \frac{1}{2 \cdot 4!} K^2_{MNPQ} \right] - \frac{1}{12{\kappa_{11}}^2} \int C_3 \wedge K_4 \wedge K_4 \ , \tag{1.33}$$

where $K_4 = dC_3$ is the 4-form field strength. In particular, K_4 obeys the field equation

$$d * K_4 = -\frac{1}{2} {K_4}^2 \tag{1.34}$$

and the Bianchi identity

$$dK_4 = 0 \ . \tag{1.35}$$

To see how a double worldvolume/spacetime compactification of the $D = 11$ supermembrane theory on S^1 leads to the Type IIA string in $D = 10$ [11], let us denote all $(d = 3, D = 11)$ quantities by a hat and all $(d = 2, D = 10)$ quantities without. We then make a ten-one split of the spacetime coordinates

$$\hat{X}^{\hat{M}} = (X^M, Y) \qquad M = 0, 1, \ldots, 9 \tag{1.36}$$

and a two-one split of the worldvolume coordinates

$$\hat{\xi}^{\hat{i}} = (\xi^i, \rho) \qquad i = 1, 2 \tag{1.37}$$

in order to make the partial gauge choice

$$\rho = Y \ , \tag{1.38}$$

which identifies the eleventh dimension of spacetime with the third dimension of the worldvolume. The dimensional reduction is then effected by taking the background fields $\hat{G}_{\hat{M}\hat{N}}$ and $\hat{C}_{\hat{M}\hat{N}\hat{P}}$ to be independent of Y. The string backgrounds of dilaton Φ, string σ-model metric G_{MN}, 1-form A_M, 2-form B_{MN} and 3-form C_{MNP} are given by[3]

$$\hat{G}_{MN} \ = \ e^{-\Phi/3} \begin{pmatrix} G_{MN} + e^{\Phi} A_M A_N & e^{\Phi} A_M \\ e^{\Phi} A_N & e^{\Phi} \end{pmatrix}$$

[3]The choice of dilaton prefactor, $e^{-\Phi/3}$, is dictated by the requirement that G_{MN} be the $D = 10$ string σ-model metric. To obtain the $D = 10$ fivebrane σ-model metric, the prefactor is unity because the reduction is then spacetime only and not simultaneous worldvolume/spacetime. This explains the remarkable "coincidence" [63] between $\hat{G}_{MN}$ and the $D = 10$ fivebrane σ-model metric.

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_{MNP} &= C_{MNP} \\ \hat{C}_{MNY} &= B_{MN} \ .\end{aligned} \tag{1.39}$$

The actions (1.32) and (1.33) now reduce to

$$\begin{aligned}S_2 = T_2 \int d^2\xi \Big[&- \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N G_{MN}(X) \\ &- \frac{1}{2!}\epsilon^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N B_{MN}(X) + \cdots \Big]\end{aligned} \tag{1.40}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}I_{10} = \frac{1}{2{\kappa_{10}}^2}\int d^{10}x\sqrt{-G}e^{-\Phi}\Big[R_G + (\partial_M \Phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2\cdot 3!}H^2_{MNP} - \frac{1}{2\cdot 2!}e^{\Phi}F^2_{MN} \\ - \frac{1}{2\cdot 4!}e^{\Phi}J^2_{MNPQ}\Big] - \frac{1}{2{\kappa_{10}}^2}\int \frac{1}{2}K_4 \wedge K_4 \wedge B_2 \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{1.41}$$

where the field strengths are given by $J_4 = K_4 + A_1 H_3$, $H_3 = dB_2$ and $F_2 = dA_1$.

One may repeat the procedure in superspace to obtain

$$S_2 = T_2 \int d^2\xi \Big[-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}E_i{}^a E_j{}^b \eta_{ab} + \frac{1}{2!}\epsilon^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N B_{MN}(Z)\Big] \tag{1.42}$$

which is just the action of the Type IIA superstring.

The double dimensional reduction described above seems superficially to be equivalent to considering an $R^{10} \times S^1$ spacetime, taking Y to be the coordinate on the circle and shrinking the radius to zero. However, it has recently been pointed out [22] that this latter procedure still retains the zero modes responsible for the membrane instability discussed in section (2.2). These membrane instabilities are absent when the membrane is wrapped around the torus of an $R^9 \times S^1 \times S^1$ spacetime [39, 22, 23]. Indeed, such a wrapped membrane exactly reproduces the (q_1, q_2) bound states of the $NS-NS$ and $R-R$ strings in Type IIB theory [19].

1.6 The signature of spacetime

If our senses are to be trusted, we live in a world with three space and one time dimensions. However, the revival of the Kaluza-Klein idea [5, 6], brought about by supergravity and superstrings, has warned us that this may be only an illusion. In any case, there is a hope, so far unfulfilled, that the four-dimensional structure that we apparently observe may actually be predicted by a *Theory of Everything*. Whatever the outcome, imagining a world

with an arbitrary number of space dimensions has certainly taught us a good deal about the properties of our three-space-dimensional world.

In spite of all this activity, and in spite of the popularity of Euclidean formulations of field theory, relatively little effort has been devoted to imagining a work with more than one *time* dimension. This is no doubt due partially to the psychological difficulties we have in treating space and time on the same footing. As H. G. Wells reminds us in *The Time Machine*: "There is, however, a tendency to draw an unreal distinction between the former three dimensions and the latter, because it happens that our consciousness moves intermittently in one direction along the latter from the beginning to the end of our lives." There are also more justifiable reasons associated with causality. Nevertheless, one might hope that a theory of everything should predict no only the *dimensionality* of spacetime, but also its *signature*.

For example, quantum consistency of the superstring requires 10 spacetime dimensions, but not necessarily the usual $(9,1)$ signature. The signature is not completely arbitrary, however, since spacetime supersymmetry allows only $(9,1)$, $(5,5)$ or $(1,9)$. Unfortunately, superstrings have as yet no answer to the question of why our universe appears to be four-dimensional, let alone why it appears to have signature $(3,1)$.

The authors of [47] therefore considered a world with an arbitrary number T of time dimensions and an arbitrary number S of space dimensions to see how far classical supermembranes restrict not only $S+T$ but S and T separately. To this end they also allowed an (s,t) signature for the worldvolume of the membrane where $s \leq S$ and $t \leq T$ but are otherwise arbitrary. It is not difficult to repeat the analysis of section (1.3) for arbitrary signatures, and to show that there is once again a matching of the bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom as a consequence of the kappa symmetry. However severe constraints on possible supermembrane theories will now follow by demanding spacetime supersymmetry.

We restrict ourselves in this section to $N=1$ flat superspace, and require θ^α to be a minimal spinor i.e. Majorana, Weyl, Majorana-Weyl etc., whenever it is possible to impose such a condition. We furthermore assume invariance under the generalized super-poincare group super-$IO(S,T)$, as required by the superspace construction of section (1.3). Such supermembranes (and their compactifications) are the only ones currently known. In section (1.7) we shall consider the possibility of other supermembrane theories obtained by requiring spacetime supersymmetry but with a different supergroup. For the moment, however, we

$S-T \bmod 8$	ϵ	η
$0,1,2$	$+1$	$+1$
$6,7,8$	$+1$	-1
$4,5,6$	-1	$+1$
$2,3,4$	-1	-1

Table 3: Values of ϵ and η

shall require super-Poincare which means, in particular, that the anticommutator of two supersymmetry charges Q yields a translation

$$\{Q, Q\} \sim P \quad . \tag{1.43}$$

This is only possible for certain values of S and T when Q is a minimal spinor.

Those values of S and T permitting minimal spinors have been determined by Kugo and Townsend [48]. See also the works of van Nieuwenhuizen [49] , Coqueraux [50] and Freund [51]. For the Clifford algebra given by $\Gamma^a\Gamma^b + \Gamma^b\Gamma^a = 2\eta^{ab}$ there exist matrices A and B for which

$$\Gamma_a^\dagger = (-1)^T A \Gamma_a A^{-1}, \quad AA^\dagger = 1 \tag{1.44}$$

$$\Gamma_a = \eta B^{-1} \Gamma_a^* B, \qquad BB^\dagger = 1,$$
$$B^* B = \epsilon \tag{1.45}$$

where ϵ and η are given in Table 3. We can choose a basis such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_a^\dagger = \quad & - \quad \Gamma_a \quad a = 1, \ldots, T \\ & + \quad \Gamma_a \quad a = T+1, \ldots D \end{aligned} \tag{1.46}$$

and

$$A = \Gamma_1 \Gamma_2 \ldots \Gamma_T \quad . \tag{1.47}$$

The charge conjugation matrix is defined as $C = \tilde{B}A$. The properties of A and B then imply

$$\tilde{\Gamma} \;=\; (-1)^T \eta C \Gamma C^{-1} \tag{1.48}$$

$$\tilde{C} \;=\; \epsilon \eta^T (-1)^{T(T+1)/2} C, \quad C^\dagger C = 1 \tag{1.49}$$

where the tilde denotes transpose. For D even, we can also define the projection operator

$$P_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}\Big[1 \pm (-1)^{(S-T)/4}\Gamma^{D+1}\Big] \tag{1.50}$$

where

$$\Gamma^{D+1} = \Gamma^1\Gamma^2\ldots\Gamma^D \ . \tag{1.51}$$

Using the above properties we find that we can have the minimal spinors given in Table 4.

The next task is to check which of these possibilities admits the super-poincare algebra. The part of the superalgebra which is the same in each case is

$$\begin{aligned}
[M_{ab}, M_{cd}] &= -i(\eta_{bc}M_{ad} - \eta_{ac}M_{bd} - \eta_{bd}M_{ac} + \eta_{ad}M_{bc}) \\
[M_{ab}, P_c] &= i(\eta_{ac}P_b - \eta_{bc}P_a) \\
[P_a, P_b] &= 0 \\
[M_{ab}, Q_\alpha] &= -\frac{i}{2}(\Gamma_{ab}Q)_\alpha \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{1.52}$$

We now examine the {Q,Q} anticommutator. Consider first $S-T = 0, 1, 2 \bmod 8$ for which Q_α is Majorana. The only possible form for the anticommutator is

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = (\Gamma^a C^{-1})_{\alpha\beta}P_a. \tag{1.53}$$

Since the left hand side is symmetric under interchange of α and β we require

$$(\Gamma_a\tilde{C}^{-1}) = \Gamma_a C^{-1} \tag{1.54}$$

but

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Gamma_a C^{-1}) &= \tilde{C}^{-1}\tilde{\Gamma}_a \\
&= \epsilon\eta^T(-1)^{T(T+1)/2}C^{-1}\tilde{\Gamma}_a \\
&= \epsilon\eta^{T+1}(-1)^{T(T-1)/2}\Gamma_a C^{-1} \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{1.55}$$

Now from Table 3, $\epsilon = \eta + 1$ for $S - T = 0, 1, 2 \bmod 8$ and hence

$$(\Gamma_a\tilde{C}^{-1}) = (-1)^{T(T-1)/2}\Gamma_a C^{-1} \tag{1.56}$$

which is compatible with (1.43) only if $T = 0, 1 \bmod 4$. Now consider the subcase $S - T = 0$ mod 8, $T = 0, 1$ mod 4. Define

$$Q_{\pm\alpha} = (P_\pm Q)_\alpha. \tag{1.57}$$

From (1.42) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\{Q_{\pm\alpha}, Q_{\pm\beta}\} &= P_{\pm\alpha\gamma}\{Q_\gamma, Q_\beta\}P_{\pm\delta\beta} \\ &= (P_\pm \Gamma_a C^{-1}\tilde{P}_\pm)_{\alpha\beta}P_a \end{aligned} \tag{1.58}$$

but

$$\begin{aligned} C^{-1}\tilde{P}_\pm &= C^{-1}\Big(1 \pm \tilde{\Gamma}_D\tilde{\Gamma}_{D-1}\ldots\tilde{\Gamma}_1\Big)C^{-1} \\ &= \Big(1 \pm \Gamma_D\Gamma_{D-1}\cdots\Gamma_1\Big) \\ &= \Big(1 \pm (-1)^{D(D-1)/2}\Gamma^{D+1}\Big)C^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{1.59}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} P_\pm\Gamma_a C^{-1}\tilde{P}_\pm &= P_\pm\Big(1 \mp (-1)^{T(2T-1)}\Gamma^{D+1}\Big)\Gamma_a C^{-1} \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{T =0 mod 4} \\ P_\pm\Gamma_a C^{-1} & \text{T = 1 mod 4} \end{cases} . \end{aligned}$$

Thus splitting up $\{Q,Q\} = \Gamma^a C^{-1}P_a$ into its chiral parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\{Q_\pm, Q_\pm\} &= P_\pm\Gamma^a C^{-1}P_a \\ \{Q_\pm, Q_\mp\} &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.60}$$

for $T = 1$ mod 4 and

$$\begin{aligned}\{Q_\pm, Q_\pm\} &= 0 \\ \{Q_\pm, Q_\mp\} &= P_\pm\Gamma^a C^{-1}P_a \end{aligned} \tag{1.61}$$

for $T = 0$ mod 4. Thus for $S - T = 0$ mod 8, only for $T = 1$ mod 4 can we set $Q_- = 0$ say, and obtain $\{Q,Q\} \sim P$ with Q a Majorana-Weyl minimal spinor.

We can proceed in this way to exhaust all the possible values of S and T admitting super-Poincare symmetry. These are summarized in Table 4, where $\bar{Q} = Q^\dagger A$. Combining these results with those of section (1.3) allows to draw the S/T plot of Table 5 whose points correspond to possible supermembrane theories. Once again we have used the symbols O, H, C and R to denote objects with $8+8$, $4+4$, $2+2$, or $1+1$ degrees of freedom, respectively. The points marked $\tilde{O}, \tilde{H}, \tilde{C}$ and $\tilde{R}$ are not permitted if, as we have assumed

Table 4: Minimal spinors for different values of $S - T$ mod 8 and super-Poincare algebras for different values of T mod 4.

S - T mod 8	Minimal spinor type	T mod 4	Anticommutator
1,2	Majorana	0,1	$\{Q, Q\} = \Gamma^a C^{-1} P_a$
6,7	pseudo-Majorana	1,2	$\{Q, Q\} = i\Gamma^a C^{-1} P_a$
0	Majorana-Weyl }	1	$\{Q_+, Q_+\} = P_+ \Gamma^a C^{-1} P_a$
	pseudo-Maj-Weyl }		$\{Q_+, Q_+\} = i P_+ \Gamma^a C^{-1} P_a$
3,5	Dirac	0,1	$\{Q, \bar{Q}\} = \Gamma^a P_a$
		2,3	$\{Q, \bar{Q}\} = i\Gamma^a P_a$
			$\{Q, Q\} = \{\bar{Q}, \bar{Q}\} = 0$
4	Weyl	1	$\{Q_+, \bar{Q}_+\} = P_+ \Gamma^a P_a$

Table 5: The brane-molecule (for scalar multiplets with $d \geq 2$ only), where R, C, H and O denote real $(1+1)$, complex $(2+2)$, quaternion $(4+4)$ and octonion $(8+8)$, respectively. Those marked with a tilde, in particular the $(2,2)$-brane in $(10,2)$, are forbidden if the algebra is super-Poincare.

$S \uparrow$													
11	.												
10	.	O	$\tilde{O}$										
9	H	H/O	O										
8	$\tilde{C}$	H											
7	$\tilde{C}$	H											
6	$\tilde{C}/\tilde{H}$	H				O	$\tilde{O}$						
5	C	C/H	H	H	H	H/O	O						
4	$\tilde{C}$	C	$\tilde{C}$	$\tilde{C}$	$\tilde{C}$	H							
3	.	R/C	$\tilde{R}$	$\tilde{R}$	$\tilde{C}$	H							
2	.	R		$\tilde{R}$	$\tilde{C}$	H				O	$\tilde{O}$		
1	.		R	R/C	C	C/H	H	H	H	H/O	O		
0	.	.	.	.	$\tilde{C}$	C	$\tilde{C}/\tilde{H}$	$\tilde{C}$	$\tilde{C}$	H	.	.	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	$T \rightarrow$

in this section, the algebra is super-Poincare. For pictorial reasons, we call this table the *brane-molecule*.

Several comments are now in order:

1) In the absence of any physical boundary conditions which treat time differently from space, and which we have not yet imposed, the mathematics will be symmetric under interchange of S and T. This can easily be seen from Table 5. For every supermembrane with (S,T) signature, there is another with (T,S). Note the self-conjugate theories that lie on the $S=T$ line which passes through the $(5,5)$ superstring.

2) There is, as yet, no restriction on the worldvolume signatures beyond the original requirement that $s \leq S$ and $t \leq T$.

3) If we were to redraw the D/d brane scan of Table 1 allowing now arbitrary signature, there would be no new S points on the plot, but rather the new solutions would be superimposed on the old ones. For example, there would now be six solutions occupying the $(d=3, D=11)$ slot instead of one.

4) Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the brane-molecule is the mod 8 periodicity. Suppose there exist signatures (s,t) and (S,T) which satisfy both the requirements of bose-fermi matching and super-Poincare invariance. Now consider (s',t') and (S',T') for which

$$s'+t' = s+t \tag{1.62}$$

$$S'+T' = S+T \quad . \tag{1.63}$$

As a consequence of the modulo 8 periodicity theorem for real Clifford algebras, the minimal condition on a spinor is modulo 8 periodic e.g. $S-T=0$ mod 8 for Majorana-Weyl. So if, in addition to (1.51) and (1.52) we also have

$$S'-T' = S-T+8n \qquad n\epsilon Z \quad . \tag{1.64}$$

then (s',t') and (S',T') satisfy bose-fermi matching. (1.52) and (1.53) imply

$$S' = S+4n \tag{1.65}$$

$$T' = T-4n \quad . \tag{1.66}$$

Since, from Table 4, the existence of a super-Poincare algebra with minimal spinors is modulo 4 periodic in T, we see from (1.54) that the super-Poincare invariance is also satisfied. Thus given the vertical sequence $(S,T)=(10,1) \rightarrow (2,1)$, modulo 8 periodicity implies the

existence of the two other vertical sequences of Table 5, namely $(6,5) \to (0,5)$ and $(2,9) \to (0,9)$. The three horizontal sequences $(1,10) \to (1,2), (5,6) \to (5,0)$ and $(9,2) \to (9,0)$ are similarly related via modulo 8 periodicity.

Note the special crossover points at $(9,1), (5,5)$ and $(1,9)$ which permit Majorana-Weyl spinors and which correspond to the top horizontal line in the brane scan of Table 1. Similarly Weyl spinors are permitted at the crossover points $(5,1)$ and $(1,5)$ corresponding to the middle horizontal line of Table 1. It is curious that the fundamental extended objects at the top of the H and C sequences are chiral, while those at the top of the O and R sequences are not.

In the usual signature all extended objects appear to suffer from ghosts because the kinetic term for the X^0 coordinate enters with the wrong sign. These are easily removed, however (at least at the classical level) by the presence of diffeomorphisms on the worldvolume which allow us to fix a gauge where only positive-norm states propagate e.g. the light cone gauge for strings and its membrane analogues. See section (2.1). Alternatively we may identify the d worldvolume coordinates ξ^i with d of the D space-time coordinates X^i $(i = 1,2,3)$ leaving $(D-d)$ coordinates X^I $(I = 1..D-d)$ with the right sign for their kinetic energy [64]. Of course, this only works if we have one worldvolume time coordinate τ that allows us to choose a light-cone gauge or else set $\tau = t$.

In the same spirit, we could now require absence of ghosts (or rather absence of classical instabilities since we are still at the classical level) for arbitrary signature by requiring that the "transverse" group $SO(S-s, T-t)$ which governs physical propagation after gauge-fixing, be compact. This requires $T = t$.

It may be argued, of course, that in a world with more than one time dimension, ghosts are the least of your problems. Moreover, in contrast to strings, unitarity on the worldvolume does not necessarily imply unitarity in spacetime (I am grateful for discussions on this point with J. Polchinski). This is becuase the transverse group no longer coincides with the little group. (For example, the $(2,1)$ object in $(10,1)$ spacetime and the $(1,2)$ object in $(9,2)$ spacetime both have transverse group $SO(8)$, but the former has little group $SO(9)$ and the latter $SO(8,1)$.) Nevertheless, it is an interesting exercise to see how compactness of the gauge group restricts the possible super-extended-objects. For example, the superstring in $(9,1)$ survives with $SO(8)$, but the superstring in $(5,5)$ with $SO(4,4)$ does not. What about the superstring in $(1,9)$? Here we once again encounter the problem that, in the absence of

any physical input, we cannot distinguish (S,T) signature from (T,S). Since positivity of the energy is only a convention in field theory, ghosts can still be avoided by choosing $S=s$ instead of $T=t$. The best thing is simply to cut the Gordian knot and demand that $S \geq T$. The resulting restricted brane molecule may be found in [47].

1.7 Twelve dimensions?

It is interesting to ask whether we have exhausted all possible theories of extended objects with spacetime supersymmetry and fermionic gauge invariance on the worldvolume and fields (X^M, θ^α). This we claimed to have done in section (1.6) by demanding super-Poincare invariance but might there exist other Green-Schwarz type actions in which the supergroup is not necessarily super-Poincare? Although we have not yet attempted to construct such actions, one may nevertheless place constraints on the dimensions and signatures for which such theories are possible. We simply impose the bose-fermi matching constraints of section (1.3) and those in the first two columns of Table 4 but relax the constraints in the second two columns which specifically assumed super-Poincare invariance. The extra allowed theories [47] are indicated by the points marked $\tilde{R}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{H}$ and $\tilde{O}$ in Table 5.

Although the possibilities are richer, there are still several constraints. Note in particular that the maximum space-time dimension is now $D=12$ provided we have signatures $(10,2)$, $(6,6)$ or $(2,10)$. These new cases are particularly interesting since they belong to the O sequence and furthermore admit Majorana-Weyl spinors. In fact, the idea of a twelfth timelike dimension in supergravity is an old one [9] and twelve-dimensional supersymmetry algebras have been discussed in the supergravity literature [52]. In particular, the chiral $(N_+, N_-) = (1,0)$ supersymmetry algebra in $(S,T)=(10,2)$ involves the anti-commutator

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = \Gamma^{MN}{}_{\alpha\beta} P_{MN} + \Gamma^{MNPQRS}{}_{\alpha\beta} Z^+{}_{MNPQRS} \tag{1.67}$$

The right hand side yields not only a Lorentz generator but also a six index object so it is certainly not super-Poincare.

In section (1.5), we obtained the Type IIA string by compactifying the $D=11$ supermembrane on a circle. An obvious question, therefore, is whether Type IIB also admits a higher-dimensional explanation. It was conjectured in [47] that the $(2,2)$ extended object moving in $(10,2)$ space-time may (if it exists) be related by simultaneous dimensional reduction to the $(1,1)$ Type IIB superstring in $(9,1)$ just as the $(2,1)$ supermembrane in $(10,1)$ is

related to the Type IIA superstring . Evidence in favor of the conjecture was supplied by the appearance of Majorana-Weyl spinors and self-dual tensors in both the twelve-dimensional and Type IIB theories. This idea becomes even more appealing if one imagines that the $SL(2,Z)$ of the Type IIB theory [16] might correspond to the modular group of a T^2 compactification from $D = 12$ to $D = 10$ just as the $SL(2,Z)$ of S-duality corresponds to the modular group of a T^2 compactification from $D = 6$ to $D = 4$ [65]. On the other hand, the absence of translations casts doubt on the naive application of the bose-fermi matching argument, and the appearance of the self-dual 6-form charge Z is suggestive of a sixbrane, rather than a threebrane.

Despite all the objections one might raise to a world with two time dimensions, and despite the above problems of interpretation, the idea of a $(2,2)$ object moving in a $(10,2)$ spacetime has recently been revived in the context of *F-theory* [53], which involves Type IIB compactification where the axion and dilaton from the Ramond-Ramond sector are allowed to vary on the internal manifold. Given a manifold M that has the structure of a fiber bundle whose fiber is T^2 and whose base is some manifold B, then

$$F \text{ on } M \equiv \text{ Type } IIB \text{ on } B \tag{1.68}$$

The utility of F-theory is beyond dispute and it has certainly enhanced our understanding of string dualities, but should the twelve-dimensions of F-theory be taken seriously? And if so, should F-theory be regarded as more fundamental than M-theory? Given that there seems to be no supersymmetric field theory with $SO(10,2)$ Lorentz invariance [66], and given that the on-shell states carry only ten-dimensional momenta [53], the more conservative interpretation is that the twelfth dimension is merely a mathematical artifact and that F-theory should simply be interpreted as a clever way of compactifying the IIB string [67]. Time (or should I say "Both times"?) will tell.

1.8 Type II p-branes: the brane scan revisited

According to the classification of [10] described in section (1.3), no Type II p-branes with $p > 1$ could exist. Moreover, the only brane allowed in $D = 11$ was $p = 2$. These conclusions were based on the assumption that the only fields propagating on the worldvolume were scalars and spinors, so that, after gauge fixing, they fall only into *scalar* supermultiplets, denoted by S on the brane scan of Table 1. Indeed, these were the only kappa symmetric

actions known at the time. Using soliton arguments, however, it was pointed out in [68, 69] that both Type IIA and Type IIB superfivebranes exist after all. Moreover, the Type IIB theory also admits a self-dual superthreebrane [70]. The no-go theorem is circumvented because in addition to the superspace coordinates X^M and θ^α there are also higher spin fields on the worldvolume: vectors or antisymmetric tensors. This raised the question: are there other super p-branes and if so, for what p and D? In [72] an attempt was made to answer this question by asking what new points on the brane scan are permitted by bose-fermi matching alone. Given that the gauge-fixed theories display worldvolume supersymmetry, and given that we now wish to include the possibility of vector and antisymmetric tensor fields, it is a relatively straightforward exercise to repeat the bose-fermi matching conditions of the section (1.3) for vector and antisymmetric tensor supermultiplets.

Let us begin with vector supermultiplets. Once again, we may proceed in one of two ways. First, given that a worldvolume vector has $(d-2)$ degrees of freedom, the scalar multiplet condition (1.29) gets replaced by

$$D - 2 = \frac{1}{2}\, mn = \frac{1}{4}\, MN. \tag{1.69}$$

Alternatively, we may simply list all the vector supermultiplets in the classification of [46] and once again interpret D via (1.31). The results [72, 27] are shown by the points labelled V in Table 1.

Next we turn to antisymmetric tensor multiplets. In $d = 6$ there is a supermultiplet with a second rank tensor whose field strength is self-dual: $(B^-_{\mu\nu}, \lambda^I, \phi^{[IJ]})$, $I = 1, \ldots, 4$. This is has chiral $d = 6$ supersymmetry. Since there are five scalars, we have $D = 6 + 5 = 11$. There is thus a new point on the scan corresponding to the $D = 11$ superfivebrane. One may decompose this $(n_+, n_-) = (2, 0)$ supermultiplet under $(n_+, n_-) = (1, 0)$ into a tensor multiplet with one scalar and a hypermultiplet with four scalars. Truncating to just the tensor multiplet gives the zero modes of a fivebrane in $D = 6 + 1 = 7$. These two tensor multiplets are shown by the points labelled T in Table 1. [4]

Several comments are now in order:

1) The number of scalars in a vector supermultiplet is such that, from (1.31), $D = 3, 4, 6$ or 10 only, in accordance with [46].

[4] I am grateful to Paul Townsend for pointing out that the $D = 11$ fivebrane was inadvertently omitted from the brane scan in [72] and to Ergin Sezgin for pointing out that the the $D = 7$ fivebrane was inadvertently ommitted from the brane scan in [27].

2) Vector supermultiplets exist for all $d \leq 10$ [46], as may be seen by dimensionally reducing the $(n = 1, d = 10)$ Maxwell supermultiplet. However, in $d = 2$ vectors have no degrees of freedom and in $d = 3$ vectors have only one degree of freedom and are dual to scalars. In this sense, therefore, these multiplets will already have been included as scalar multiplets in section (1.3). There is consequently some arbitrariness in whether we count these as new points on the scan and in [72, 27] they were omitted. For example, it was recognized [72] that by dualizing a vector into a scalar on the gauge-fixed $d = 3$ worldvolume of the Type IIA supermembrane, one increases the number of worldvolume scalars, *i.e.* transverse dimensions, from 7 to 8 and hence obtains the corresponding worldvolume action of the $D = 11$ supermembrane. Thus the $D = 10$ Type IIA theory contains a hidden $D = 11$ Lorentz invariance [72, 54, 91]!

3) This dualizing of the scalar into a vector on the 3-dimensional worldvolume, which has the effect of lowering the spacetime dimension by one, is a special case of a more general phenomenon of dualizing scalars into antisymmetric tensors of rank $(d-2)$ on a d-dimensional worldvolumes. For example in [41], it is argued that one should also include new points on the scan with $(d = 6, D = 9)$, $(d = 5, D = 8)$, $(d = 4, D = 7)$ and $(d = 4, D = 5)$ obtained by dualizing one of the four scalars in the hypermultiplets describing the known points at $(d = 6, D = 10)$, $(d = 5, D = 9)$, $(d = 4, D = 8)$ and $(d = 4, D = 6)$. The problem with this is knowing when to stop. Although [46] lists the particle content in all the multiplets allowed by supersymmetry, it does not list all possible field representations. Depending on its interactions, a scalar may or may not admit a dualization. An interesting example of this dilemma is provided by the fivebrane multiplet $(B^-_{\mu\nu}, \lambda^I, \phi^{[IJ]})$, $I = 1, \ldots, 4$ which has five scalars and hence seems to be intrinsically eleven dimensional. However, it was originally proposed as the worldvolume of the $D = 10$ Type IIA fivebrane [68, 69]. Does this interpretation therefore demand that we can dualize one of the scalars? Or should we turn the argument around to say that the inability to dualize is yet another indication that the strong coupling limit of the Type IIA theory is necessarily eleven-dimensional?

4) In listing vector multiplets, we have focussed only on the abelian theories obtained by dimensionally reducing the Maxwell multiplet. One might ask what role, if any, is played by non-abelian Yang-Mills multiplets. See below.

5) We emphasize that the points labelled V and T merely tell us what is allowed by bose/fermi matching. We must then try to establish which of these possibilities actually

exists. When this scan was first written down in 1993 [72] we knew of the following soliton solutions: First the Type IIA and Type IIB superfivebranes [68, 69] and the self-dual Type IIB superthreebrane [70] (the first example of a supermembrane carrying Ramond-Ramond charges) all found in 1991, then the $D = 11$ superfivebrane [71] found in 1992, then the Type IIA p branes with all $p = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$ found in 1993. The other points labelled V were still something of a mystery. To see why these choices of p were singled out, we recall that Type II string theories differ from heterotic theories in one important respect: in addition to the usual Neveu-Schwarz charge associated with the 3-form field strength, they also carry Ramond-Ramond charges associated with 2-form and 4-form field strengths in the case of Type IIA and 3-forms and 5-forms in the case of Type IIB. Accordingly, the new solutions of the Type IIA string equations were found to describe *electric* super p-branes with $p = 0, 2$ and their *magnetic* duals with $p = 6, 4$ and new solutions of Type IIB string equations were found to describe *electric* super p-branes with $p = 1, 3$ and their *magnetic* duals with $p = 5, 3$. Interestingly enough, the Type IIB superthreebrane is *self-dual*, carrying a magnetic charge equal to its electric charge [70].

However, the whole subject of Type II supermembranes underwent a major sea change in 1995 when Polchinski [12] realized that Type II super p-branes carrying Ramond-Ramond charges admit the interpretation of *Dirichlet-branes* that had been proposed earlier in 1989 [73]. These D-branes are surfaces of dimension p on which open strings can end. The Dirichlet p-brane is defined by Neumann boundary conditions in $(p + 1)$ directions (the worldvolume itself) and Dirichlet boundary conditions in the remaining $(D-p-1)$ transverse directions. In $D = 10$, they exist for even $p = 0, 2, 4, 6, 8$ in the Type IIA theory and odd $p = -1, 1, 3, 5, 7, 9$ in the Type IIB theory, in complete correspondence with the points marked V on the brane scan of Table 1. The fact that these points preserve one half of the spacetime supersymmetry and are described by dimensionally reducing the $(n = 1, d = 10)$ Maxwell multiplet fits in perfectly with the D-brane picture. In hindsight there also exists a Type IIB supergravity interpretation of the (-1)-brane, which is an instanton, and its 7-brane dual [81]. The 9-brane emerges from the fact that purely Neumann strings can end anywhere. Also in hindsight the 8-branes of the Type IIA theory also admit a soliton interpretation [80] because there exists a version of $D = 10$ Type IIA supergravity with a gravitino mass term and cosmological constant proposed by Romans [74]. But in D dimensions a cosmological term is equivalent to a rank D antisymmetric tensor field strength

[77, 78], and hence yields a $(D-2)$ -brane, which is a *domain wall*. Domain walls are dual to (-2)-branes [79] (whatever that means).

Moreover when N branes coincide, the individual $U(1)$s on each brane conspire to form a non-abelian $U(N)$ [75, 76] thus filling in the non-abelian gap in the supermultiplets. The reader is referred to Polchinski's lectures [31] for a full account of the D-brane revolution.

The bosonic sector of the worldvolume actions for these D-branes is known to be described by a Born-Infeld Lagrangian . From a bosonic point of view, this can be deduced from their open-string interpretation [82, 83]; from a fermionic point of view, this is suggested by the solitonic interpretation: half of the spacetime supersymmetries are non-linearly realized on the soliton worldvolume [70]. The programme to display the covariant kappa symmetric actions for these Type II p-branes, spurred on by their interpretation as D-branes, has only recently yielded any results: the $D = 10$ superthreebrane [70] equations in a Type IIB supergravity background was constructed in [84]; all the $D = 10$ D-branes in a flat background in [85] and all the $D = 10$ D-branes in supergravity backgrounds in [92, 86]. A different approach in [41, 42] provides them in a version with both manifest spacetime and worldvolume supersymmetry [41], and also the related $D = 11$ superfivebrane [42]. The action of [85] is given by

$$S = -\int d^{p+1}\xi\sqrt{-det(G_{\mu\nu}+\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu})} + \int \Omega_{p+1} \tag{1.70}$$

where

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{mn}\Pi^m{}_\mu\Pi^n{}_\nu, \tag{1.71}$$

$$\Pi^m{}_\mu = \partial_\mu X^m - \bar{\theta}\Gamma^m\partial_\mu\theta, \tag{1.72}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} = F_{\mu\nu} - b_{\mu\nu}, \tag{1.73}$$

where $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ and where

$$b = \bar{\theta}\Gamma_{11}\Gamma_m d\theta\left(dX^m - \frac{1}{2}\bar{\theta}\Gamma^m d\theta\right). \tag{1.74}$$

This is the formula for p even. When p is odd, Γ_{11} is replaced by τ_3. Ω_{p+1} is a $(p+1)$-form Wess–Zumino-type term. S_1 and S_2 are separately invariant under the global IIA or IIB super-Poincare group as well as under $(p+1)$-dimensional general coordinate transformations. However, local kappa symmetry is achieved by a subtle conspiracy between them [85], just as in the case of super p-branes with scalar supermultiplets (1.18).

To date, no kappa symmetric actions have been written down for the $D = 11$ (or Type IIA) superfivebrane or the $D = 10$ heterotic fivebrane.

Finally, it has been suggested that there might be a $D = 11$ superninebrane [94, 41] denoted by "?" on the brane scan of Table 1.3, which in turn suggests a formulation of $D = 11$ supergravity with an 11-form field strength. This might then explain both the Type IIA supereightbrane and the Romans formulation of Type IIA supergravity from an eleven-dimensional point of view. If so, one might expect R^6 corrections to the nine brane Bianchi identity coming from ninebrane worldvolume Lorentz anomalies just as one obtains R^4 corrections to the fivebrane Bianchi identities coming from fivebrane worldvolume anomalies [14]. This, in turn would mean $K_0 R^6$ corrections to the $D = 11$ supergravity action (written as an integral over a 12-manifold) in addition to the $K_4 R^4$ already known [14], where K_0 and K_4 are respectively dual to the ninebrane and fivebrane field strengths. However, if one follows the rule (1.31) for counting transverse dimensions, such a ninebrane would have to have one scalar on its worldvolume [41] and that means the zero modes might have to include the $(n = 1, d = 10)$ supergravity multiplet itself! Consequently, this would violate the usual folklore that there are no spin 2 zero modes on the worldvolume. (One could also add $(n = 1, d = 10)$ vector multiplets since these have no scalars.) On the other hand, it might fit in nicely with the work of Horava and Witten [93] who have shown that the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string corresponds to the $D = 11$ theory on $R^{10} \times S^1/Z_2$, so that the space does indeed have "ninebrane" boundaries.

2 Aspects of quantization

2.1 The lightcone gauge: area-preserving diffeomorphisms

In the string theory, the lightcone gauge is convenient for quantization because it allows the elimination of all unphysical degrees of freedom and unitarity is guaranteed. Of course, one loses manifest Lorentz invariance and one must be careful to check that it is not destroyed by quantization.

In membrane theory, however, the lightcone gauge does not eliminate all unphysical degrees of freedom. Let us split

$$X^\mu = \left\{ X^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(X^0 \pm \ X^{D-1} \right); \quad X^I, I = 1 \ldots, (D-2) \right\} \tag{2.1}$$

and then set

$$\dot{X}^+ = p^+ \tag{2.2}$$

where the dot denotes differentiation with respect to τ, the time coordinate on the worldvolume. One can then solve for X^- leaving the $(D-1)$ variables X^I. For membranes, however, only $(D-d)$ variables are physical as explained in section (1.3). Thus the lightcone gauge must leave a residual gauge invariance [55]. Let us focus our attention on a $d = 3$ bosonic membrane in flat spacetime. The lightcone action turns out to be

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau \int d^2\sigma \Big[\Big(D_0 X^I \Big)^2 - det \partial_a X^I \partial_b X^I \Big) \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$D_0 = \partial_0 + u^a(\sigma, \tau)\partial_a; \quad \partial_0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}, \ \partial_a = \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma^a}, a = 1, 2 \quad . \tag{2.4}$$

D_0 is a "covariant time derivative" with "gauge field" u^a satisfying

$$\partial_a u^a = 0 \quad . \tag{2.5}$$

The action possesses a gauge invariance that ensures that only $(D-3)$ of the $(D-2)$ X^I are physical. For a membrane of spherical topology, the solution to (2.5) is

$$u^a = \epsilon^{ab} \partial_b \omega \tag{2.6}$$

If we now introduce the Lie bracket

$$\{f, g\} = \epsilon^{ab} \partial_a f \ \partial_b g \tag{2.7}$$

the action may be rewritten in polynomial form

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau \int d^2\sigma \Big[\Big(\partial_0 X^I - \{\omega, X^I\} \Big)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \{X^I, X^J, \} \{X^I, X^J\} \Big] \quad . \tag{2.8}$$

Remarkably, this looks like a $(D-1)$ dimensional Yang-Mills theory dimensionally reduced to one time dimension. To be more precise, consider the correspondence

$$X^I \ \rightarrow \ A^I \tag{2.9}$$

$$\omega \ \rightarrow \ A_o \tag{2.10}$$

$$\{, \} \ \rightarrow \ [,] \tag{2.11}$$

$$\int d^2\sigma \ \rightarrow \ tr \tag{2.12}$$

then (2.12) describes a Yang-Mills theory with infinite dimensional gauge group. Including the fermions, we get the supersymmetric action

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int d\tau tr\Big\{\Big(D_0 A^I\Big)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\Big[A^I, A^J\Big]\ \Big[A^J, A^I\Big] + i\bar{\lambda}D_0\lambda + i\bar{\lambda}\gamma^I\ \Big[A^I,\lambda\Big]\Big\} \tag{2.13}$$

where the fields (A_0, A^I) and λ^α are all in the adjoint representation of $SU(\infty)$. This group is, in fact, the subgroup of the worldvolume diffeomorphism group that preserves the Lie bracket (2.7) and is known as the group of area-preserving diffeomorphisms. For spherical membranes, this group is given [55] by $\lim N \to \infty\ SU(N)$. The toroidal case is discussed in [56]. Here, as for Riemann surfaces of genus $g \geq 1$, one must take into account that the solution (2.6) is valid only locally.

One can generalize these results to the $d = 3$ supermembranes [57] in $D = 4, 5, 7$ and 11, and one finds super Yang-Mills quantum mechanical models corresponding to the dimensional reduction of super Yang-Mills in $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10, which provides yet another way of understanding the allowed values of D. (One might conjecture a similar relationship between the $d > 3$ membranes and quantum mechanical models, but this time the gauge symmetry could not be of the Yang-Mills type. It has been suggested [7] that they are given by infinite dimensional non-Abelian antisymmetric tensor gauge theories.)

2.2 Massless states and anomalies

The connection between supersymmetric Yang-Mills quantum-mechanical models and supermembranes has proved useful in the debate about the spectrum of the supermembrane and the issue of whether or not it contains massless particles. The membrane supercharge and the Hamiltonian are given by

$$Q = \int\ d^2\sigma\Big[P_I\gamma^I + \frac{1}{2}\ \{X^I, X^J\}\gamma^{IJ}\Big]$$

$$H = \int\ d^2\sigma\ \Big[\frac{1}{2}P_I^2 + \frac{1}{2}h^{ab}\lambda^\dagger\gamma_a\gamma\partial_b\lambda + \frac{1}{4}\ \Big\{X^I, X^J\Big\}\ \Big\{X^I, X^J\Big\}\Big] \tag{2.14}$$

where

$$\gamma_a = \partial_a X^I\gamma^I \tag{2.15}$$

and

$$\gamma = \frac{i}{2}\epsilon^{ab}\partial_a X^I\partial_b X^J\gamma^{IJ} \quad . \tag{2.16}$$

One sees, classically, that the membrane Hamiltonian is positive semi-definite and that the zero energy configurations are those for which the potential energy

$$h = det\partial_a X^I \partial_b X^J = \frac{1}{2} \left\{X^I, X^J\right\} \left\{X^I, X^J\right\} \tag{2.17}$$

vanishes. These are just the "collapsed" membranes with zero area. (Intuitively, one would expect membranes and higher dimensional objects to be different from strings in this respect, because of the ability to deform the object without increasing its volume.) Since the charges Q and H obey

$$\{Q^A, Q^\dagger_B\} = 2\delta^A_B H \tag{2.18}$$

and the quantum Hamiltonian is positive semi-definite and the zero-energy states are those annihilated by Q i.e. the supersymmetric states, it seems reasonable to conclude that the supermembrane contains massless states provided that supersymmetry is not broken [39].

At the level of perturbation theory, Bars, Pope and Sezgin [87] have shown that this expectation is borne out. They conclude that in flat $D = 11$ spacetime, the massless sector of the supermembrane is just $D = 11$ supergravity, just as the massless sector of the superstring is $D = 10$ supergravity. Curiously, they find that although the other super extended objects in the R, C and H sequences also have massless particles, the corresponding supermultiplet is *not* the supergravity multiplet. The apparent mismatch between the background fields in the supermembrane action and the massless states for the R, C and H sequences, suggests that these theories are inconsistent. As discussed in section 2.1, the price to be paid for a unitary gauge is the loss of manifest Lorentz invariance. Sure enough, it has been shown by Bars [88] and Bars and Pope [89] that all the members of the R, C and H sequences suffer from anomalies[5].

The major problem with the anomaly-free eleven-dimensional supermembrane, however, as pointed out in [57, 90] is that it seems to have a continuous rather than discrete spectrum as a consequence of the flat directions of the potential discussed in section (2.1). Banks, Fischler, Susskind and Shenker [21] have recently turned this around to make a virtue of necessity, and suggested that M-theory should be identified with the supersymmetric $SU(\infty)$ matrix model desribed in section (2.1). Following Townsend [91], they identify the membrane with an infinite collection of D 0-branes since the action for N coincident D 0-branes is given

[5]Note that this refers to the "neutral" p-branes [3] and not the "heterotic" p-branes.

precisely by the above $SU(N)$ matrix models. In their picture, a continuous spectrum is to be welcomed!

3 P-Branes as Solitons

The study of supermembranes received further impetus with their interpretation as *solitons*. Solitons [95, 96, 98], sometimes called *topological defects* [99] are important in quantum field theory for a variety of reasons. Their existence means that the full non-perturbative theory may have a much richer structure than is apparent in perturbation theory. For example, the electrically charged *elementary* particle spectrum may need to be augmented by magnetically charged *solitonic* particles. The former carry a Noether charge following from the equations of motion while the latter carry a topological charge associated with the Bianchi identities. That these magnetic monopoles are intrinsically non-perturbative is apparent from their mass formula which depends inversely on the coupling constant. The spectrum might also contain *dyons*, particles carrying both electric and magnetic charge.

In four spacetime dimensions, extended solitonic objects, strings and domain walls, are also possible. In modern parlance, they might be known as *p-branes* with $p = 0, 1, 2$, where $d = p + 1$ is the dimension of the worldvolume swept out by the soliton. In these lectures, we shall use the word *solitons* to mean any such non-singular lumps of field energy which solve the field equations, which have finite mass per unit p-volume and which are prevented from dissipating by some topological conservation law. Their existence, which in some grand unified theories is actually mandatory, has far-reaching implications both at the microscopic and cosmic scales [97].

However, it is now commonly believed that ordinary quantum field theory is inadequate for a unification of all the forces including gravity and that it must be supplanted by superstring theory or something even grander such as M-theory [11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 14, 15, 19, 20, 32, 29, 21]. If this is true then soliton solutions of string theory and M-theory must be even more important. Although the revival of the string idea is now twelve years old, it is only recently that much attention has been devoted to the subject of solitons [27]. This interest has in part been brought about by the realization that the really crucial questions of string theory: "How does the string choose a vacuum state?"; "How does the string break supersymmetry?"; "How does the string cope with the cosmological constant problem?" cannot

be answered within the framework of a weak coupling perturbation expansion.

As we have seen, the development of supermembranes did not at first proceed in the soliton direction, despite the soliton approach of the original paper [2]. The next soliton development came when Townsend [123] pointed out that not merely the $D = 6$ threebrane but all the points on the $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R}$ sequences correspond to topological defects of some globally supersymmetric field theory which break half the spacetime supersymmetries. This partial breaking of supersymmetry, already discussed in [2], is a key idea and is intimately connected with the worldvolume kappa symmetry which allows one to gauge away half of the fermionic degrees of freedom. He conjectured that the p-branes in the $\mathcal{O}$ sequence would also admit such a solitonic interpretation within the context of supergravity.

The first hint in this direction came from Dabholkar et al. [101] who presented a multi-string solution which in $D = 10$ indeed breaks half the supersymmetries. They obtained the solution by solving the low-energy 3-form supergravity equations of motion coupled to a string σ-model source and demonstrated that it saturated a Bogomol'nyi bound and satisfied an associated zero-force condition, these properties being intimately connected with the existence of unbroken spacetime supersymmetry. We shall shortly rederive this string solution and point out the existence of the Bogomol'nyi bound between the ADM mass per unit length and charge per unit length and discuss the zero-force condition which arises from the preservation of half the spacetime supersymmetries.

However, this $D = 10$ string was clearly not the soliton anticipated by Townsend because it described a singular configuration with a δ-function source at the string location. Moreover, its charge per unit length e_2 was an "electric" Noether charge associated with the equation of motion of the antisymmetric tensor field rather than a "magnetic" topological charge associated with the Bianchi identities. Consequently, in the current literature on the subject, this solution is now referred to as the "fundamental" or "elementary" string. Similarly, the supermembrane solution of $D = 11$ supergravity found in [115] did not seem to be solitonic either because it was also obtained by coupling to a membrane σ-model source [6].

The next major breakthrough for p-branes as solitons came with the paper of Strominger [125], who showed that $D = 10$ supergravity coupled to super Yang-Mills (without a σ-model source), which is the field theory limit of the heterotic string, admits as a solution

[6] Curiously, however, the curvature computed from its σ-model metric is finite at the location of the source, in contrast to the case of the elementary string [124].

the heterotic fivebrane. In contrast to the elementary string, this fivebrane is a genuine soliton, being everywhere nonsingular and carrying a topological magnetic charge g_6. A crucial part of the construction was a Yang-Mills instanton in the four directions transverse to the fivebrane. He went on to suggest a complete strong/weak coupling duality with the strongly coupled string corresponding to the weakly coupled fivebrane and vice-versa, thus providing a solitonic interpretation of the string/fivebrane duality conjecture. In this form, string/fivebrane duality is in a certain sense an analog of the Montonen-Olive conjecture discussed in section (5.1), according to which the magnetic monopole states of four-dimensional spontaeously broken supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories may be viewed from a dual perspective as fundamental in their own right and in which the roles of the elementary and solitonic states are interchanged.

This strong/weak coupling idea received further support from the point of view of Poincare duality in [129]. There it was shown that the just as the string loop expansion parameter is given by $\mathrm{g}_2 = e^{\phi_0}$, where ϕ_0 is the dilaton vev, so the analogous fivebrane parameter is given by $\mathrm{g}_6 = e^{-\phi_0/3}$ and hence that $\mathrm{g}_6 = \mathrm{g}_2^{-1/3}$. The same paper also established a Dirac quantization rule $\kappa^2 T_2 T_6 = n\pi$, where n is an integer, relating the fivebrane tension T_6 to the string tension T_2, which followed from the corresponding rule for the electric and magnetic charges generalized to extended objects [102, 103] $e_2 g_6 = 2n\pi$.

In keeping with the viewpoint that the fivebrane may be regarded as fundamental in its own right, the elementary fivebrane solution [119] was constructed by coupling the 7-form version of supergravity to a fivebrane σ-model source in analogy with the elementary string. This carries an electric charge $\tilde{e}_6$. String/fivebrane duality then suggested that by coupling the 7-form version of supergravity to super Yang-Mills (without a σ-model source), one ought to find a nonsingular heterotic string soliton carrying a topological magnetic charge $\tilde{g}_2$. Here one would expect an eight-dimensional Yang-Mills instanton in the eight directions transverse to the string. This was indeed the case [130], but scaling arguments required an unconventional Yang-Mills Lagrangian, quartic in the field strengths, which, however, is only to be expected in a fivebrane loop expansion [130, 131].

Somewhat surprisingly, the elementary fivebrane, as pointed out by Callan, Harvey and Strominger [68, 69], could also be regarded as a soliton when viewed from the dual perspective, with $g_6 = \tilde{e}_6$. In other words, it provides a nonsingular solution of the source-free 3-form equations even without the presence of Yang-Mills fields. By the same token, when

viewed from the dual perspective, the elementary string provides a nonsingular solution of the source-free 7-form equationswith $\tilde{g}_2 = e_2$ [129, 119]. Then Callan Harvey and Strominger showed that similar results also appear in both Type IIA and Type IIB string theories [68, 69]; they also admit fivebrane solitons.

3.1 The elementary string

We begin by recalling the elementary string solution of [101]. We want to find a vacuum-like supersymmetric configuration with $D = 2$ super-Poincare symmetry from the 3-form version of $D = 10, N = 1$ supergravity theory. As usual, the fermionic fields should vanish for this configuration. We start by making an ansatz for the $D = 10$ metric g_{MN}, 2-form B_{MN} and dilaton ϕ ($M = 0, 1, \cdots, 9$) corresponding to the most general eight-two split invariant under $P_2 \times SO(8)$, where P_2 is the $D = 2$ Poincare group. We split the indices

$$x^M = (x^\mu, y^m), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mu = 0, 1$ and $m = 2, \cdots, 9$, and write the line element as

$$ds^2 = e^{2A}\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + e^{2B}\delta_{mn}dy^m dy^n, \tag{3.2}$$

and the two-form gauge field as

$$B_{01} = -e^C. \tag{3.3}$$

All other components of B_{MN} and all components of the gravitino ψ_M and dilatino λ are set zero. P_2 invariance requires that the arbitrary functions A, B and C depend only on y^m; $SO(8)$ invariance then requires that this dependence be only through $y = \sqrt{\delta_{mn}y^m y^n}$. Similarly, our ansatz for the dilaton is

$$\phi = \phi(y). \tag{3.4}$$

As we shall now show, the four arbitrary functions A, B, C, and ϕ are reduced to one by the requirement that the above field configurations preserve some unbroken supersymmetry. In other words, there must exist Killing spinors ε satisfying [101]

$$\delta\psi_M = D_M\varepsilon + \frac{1}{96}\, e^{-\phi/2}(\Gamma_M{}^{NPQ} - 9\ \delta_M{}^N\Gamma^{PQ})H_{NPQ}\ \varepsilon = 0, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\delta\lambda = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\ \Gamma^M\partial_M\phi\varepsilon + \frac{1}{24\sqrt{2}}\ e^{-\phi/2}\ \Gamma^{MNP}H_{MNP}\ \varepsilon = 0, \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$H_{MNP} = 3\partial_{[M} A_{NP]}. \tag{3.7}$$

Here Γ_A are the $D = 10$ Dirac matrices satisfying

$$\{\Gamma_A, \Gamma_B\} = 2\eta_{AB}. \tag{3.8}$$

A, B refer to the $D = 10$ tangent space, $\eta_{AB} = (-, +, \cdots, +)$, and

$$\Gamma_{AB\cdots C} = \Gamma_{[A}\Gamma_{B\cdots}\Gamma_{C]}, \tag{3.9}$$

thus $\Gamma_{AB} = \frac{1}{2}\ (\Gamma_A\Gamma_B - \Gamma_B\Gamma_A)$, etc. The Γ's with world-indices $P, Q, R, \cdots$ have been converted using vielbeins $e_M{}^A$. We make an eight-two split

$$\Gamma_A = (\gamma_\alpha \otimes 1, \gamma_3 \otimes \Sigma_a), \tag{3.10}$$

where γ_α and Σ_a are the $D = 2$ and $D = 8$ Dirac matrices, respectively. We also define

$$\gamma_3 = \gamma_0\gamma_1, \tag{3.11}$$

so that $\gamma_3^2 = 1$ and

$$\Gamma_9 = \Sigma_2\Sigma_3\cdots\Sigma_9, \tag{3.12}$$

so that $\Gamma_9^2 = 1$. The most general spinor consistent with $P_2 \times SO(8)$ invariance takes the form

$$\varepsilon(x, y) = \epsilon \otimes \eta, \tag{3.13}$$

where ϵ is a spinor of $SO(1, 1)$ which may be further decomposed into chiral eigenstates via the projection operators $(1 \pm \gamma_3)$ and η is an $SO(8)$ spinor which may further be decomposed into chiral eigenstates via the projection operators $(1 \pm \Gamma_9)$. The $N = 1, D = 10$ supersymmetry parameter is, however, subject to the ten-dimensional chirality condition

$$\Gamma_{11}\ \varepsilon = \varepsilon, \tag{3.14}$$

where $\Gamma_{11} = \gamma_3 \otimes \Gamma_9$ and so the $D = 2$ and $D = 8$ chiralities are correlated.

Substituting the ansatz into the supersymmetry transformation rules leads to the solution [101]

$$\varepsilon = e^{3\phi/8}\epsilon_0 \otimes \eta_0, \tag{3.15}$$

where ϵ_0 and η_0 are constant spinors satisfying

$$(1-\gamma_3)\epsilon_0 = 0, \quad (1-\Gamma_9)\eta_0 = 0, \tag{3.16}$$

and where

$$A = \frac{3\phi}{4} + c_A, \tag{3.17}$$

$$B = -\frac{\phi}{4} + c_B, \tag{3.18}$$

$$C = 2\phi + 2c_A, \tag{3.19}$$

where c_A and c_B are constants. If we insist that the metric is asymptotically Minkowskian, then

$$c_A = -\frac{3\phi_0}{4}, \quad c_B = \frac{\phi_0}{4}, \tag{3.20}$$

where ϕ_0 is the value of ϕ at infinity *i.e.* the dilaton vev $\phi_0 = <\phi>$. The condition (3.16) means that one half of the supersymmetries are broken.

At this stage the four unknown functions A, B, C and ϕ have been reduced to one by supersymmetry. To determine ϕ, we must substitute the ansatz into the field equations which follow from the action $I_{10}(\text{string}) + S_2$ where $I_{10}(\text{string})$ is the bosonic sector of the 3-form version of $D = 10, N = 1$ supergravity given by

$$I_{10}(\text{string}) = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\int d^{10}x\ \sqrt{-g}\ \Big(R - \frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2\cdot 3!}\ e^{-\phi}H^2\Big), \tag{3.21}$$

and S_2 is the string σ-model action. Up until now we have employed the canonical choice of metric for which the gravitational action is the conventional Einstein-Hilbert action. This metric is related to the metric appearing naturally in the string σ-model by

$$g_{MN}(\text{string } \sigma\text{–model}) = e^{\phi/2} g_{MN}(\text{canonical}), \tag{3.22}$$

In canonical variables, therefore, the string σ-model action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 \ &= \ -T_2 \int d^2\xi \Big(\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\ \gamma^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N g_{MN}\ e^{\phi/2} - 2\ \sqrt{-\gamma} \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{2!}\ \varepsilon^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N B_{MN}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

We have denoted the string tension by T_2. The supergravity field equations are

$$\begin{aligned} &R^{MN} - \frac{1}{2}\ \Big(\partial^M\phi\ \partial^N\phi - \frac{1}{2}\ g^{MN}(\partial\phi)^2\Big) - \frac{1}{2}\ g^{MN}R \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\cdot 2!}\Big(H^M{}_{PQ}H^{NPQ} - \frac{1}{6}\ g^{MN}H^2\Big)e^{-\phi} = \kappa^2 T^{MN}(\text{string}), \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

where

$$T^{MN}(\text{string}) = -T_2 \int d^2\xi \sqrt{-\gamma}\ \gamma^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N e^{\phi/2}\ \frac{\delta^{10}(x-X)}{\sqrt{-g}}, \tag{3.25}$$

$$\partial_M(\sqrt{-g}\ e^{-\phi}H^{MNP}) = 2\kappa^2 T_2 \int d^2\xi\ \varepsilon^{ij}\partial_i X^N \partial_j X^P \delta^{10}(x-X), \tag{3.26}$$

$$\partial_M(\sqrt{-g}g^{MN}\partial_N\phi) + \frac{1}{2\cdot 3!}\ e^{-\phi}H^2 = \\ = \frac{\kappa^2 T_2}{2}\int d^6\xi\sqrt{-\gamma}\ \gamma^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N g_{MN} e^{\phi/2}\delta^{10}(x-X). \tag{3.27}$$

Furthermore, the string field equations are

$$\partial_i(\sqrt{-\gamma}\ \gamma^{ij}\partial_j X^N g_{MN}\ e^{\phi/2}) - \frac{1}{2}\ \sqrt{-\gamma}\ \gamma^{ij}\partial_i X^N \partial_j X^P \partial_M(g_{NP}\ e^{\phi/2}) - \\ \frac{1}{2}\ \varepsilon^{ij}\partial_i X^N \partial_j X^P H_{MNP} = 0, \tag{3.28}$$

and

$$\gamma_{ij} = \partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N g_{MN} e^{\phi/2}. \tag{3.29}$$

To solve these coupled supergravity-string equations we make the static gauge choice

$$X^\mu = \xi^\mu, \quad \mu = 0, 1 \tag{3.30}$$

and the ansatz

$$X^m = Y^m = \text{constant}, \qquad m = 2, ..., 9. \tag{3.31}$$

As an example, let us now substitute the ansatz into and the 2-form equation. We find

$$\delta^{mn}\partial_m\partial_n e^{-2\phi} = -2\kappa^2 T_2 e^{-\phi_0/2}\delta^8(y), \tag{3.32}$$

and hence

$$e^{-2\phi} = e^{-2\phi_0}\left(1 + \frac{k_2}{y^6}\right), \tag{3.33}$$

where the constant k_2 is given by

$$k_2 \equiv \frac{\kappa^2 T_2}{3\Omega_7}\ e^{3\phi_0/2}, \tag{3.34}$$

and Ω_n is the volume of the unit n-sphere S^n. One may verify by using the expressions for the Ricci tensor R^{MN} and Ricci scalar R in terms of A and B [27] that all the field equations are reduced to a single equation (3.34).

Having established that the supergravity configuration preserves half the supersymmetries, we must also verify that the string configuration also preserve these supersymmetries. As discussed in [64], the criterion is that in addition to the existence of Killing spinors we must also have

$$(1-\Gamma)\varepsilon = 0, \tag{3.35}$$

where the choice of sign is dictated by the choice of the sign in the Wess-Zumino term in S_2, and where

$$\Gamma \equiv \frac{1}{2!\sqrt{-\gamma}}\ \varepsilon^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N \Gamma_{MN}. \tag{3.36}$$

Since $\Gamma^2 = 1$ and tr $\Gamma = 0$, $\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \Gamma)$ act as projection operators. For our solution, we find that

$$\Gamma = \gamma_3 \otimes 1, \tag{3.37}$$

and hence (3.36) is satisfied. This explains, from a string point of view, why the solutions we have found preserve just half the supersymmetries. It originates from the fermionic kappa symmetry of the superstring action. The fermionic zero-modes on the worldvolume are just the Goldstone fermions associated with the broken supersymmetry.

As shown in [101], the elementary string solution saturates a Bogolmol'nyi bound for the mass per unit length

$$\mathcal{M}_2 = \int d^8y\ \theta_{00}, \tag{3.38}$$

where θ_{MN} is the total energy-momentum pseudotensor of the combined gravity-matter system. One finds

$$\kappa\mathcal{M}_2 \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|e_2|e^{\phi_0/2}, \tag{3.39}$$

where e_2 is the Noether "electric " charge whose conservation follows the equation of motion of the 2-form, namely

$$e_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\kappa}\int\limits_{S^7} e^{-\phi}\,{}^*H, \tag{3.40}$$

where * denotes the Hodge dual using the canonical metric and the integral is over an asymptotic seven-sphere surrounding the string. We find for our solution that

$$\mathcal{M}_2 = e^{\phi_0/2}\ T_2, \tag{3.41}$$

and

$$e_2 = \sqrt{2}\kappa\ T_2. \tag{3.42}$$

Hence the bound is saturated. This provides another way, in addition to unbroken supersymmetry, to understand the stability of the solution.

3.2 The solitonic fivebrane

The elementary string discussed above is a solution of the coupled field-string system with action $I_{10}(\text{string})+S_2$. As such it exhibits δ-function singularities at $y=0$. It is characterized by a non-vanishing Noether electric charge e_2. By contrast, we now wish to find a solitonic fivebrane, corresponding to a solution of the source free equations resulting from $I_{10}(\text{string})$ alone and which will be characterized by a non-vanishing topological "magnetic" charge g_6.

To this end, we now make an ansatz invariant under $P_6\times SO(4)$. Hence we write (3.1) and (3.2) as before where now $\mu=0,1\ldots5$ and $m=6,7,8,9$. The ansatz for the antisymmetric tensor, however, will now be made on the field strength rather than on the potential. From section (3.1) we recall that a non-vanishing electric charge corresponds to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\kappa}e^{-\phi*}H=e_2\varepsilon_7/\Omega_7, \tag{3.43}$$

where ε_n is the volume form on S^n. Accordingly, to obtain a non-vanishing magnetic charge, we make the ansatz

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\kappa}H=g_6\varepsilon_3/\Omega_3. \tag{3.44}$$

Since this is an harmonic form, H can no longer be written globally as the curl of B, but it satisfies the Bianchi identity. It is now not difficult to show that all the field equations are satisfied. The solution is given by

$$e^{2\phi}=e^{2\phi_0}\left(1+\frac{k_6}{y^2}\right), \tag{3.45}$$

$$ds^2=e^{-(\phi-\phi_0)/2}\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu+e^{3(\phi-\phi_0)/2}\delta_{mn}dy^m dy^n, \tag{3.46}$$

$$H=2k_6e^{\phi_0/2}\varepsilon_3, \tag{3.47}$$

where $\mu,\nu=0,1,...,5$, $m,n=6,7,8,9$ and where

$$k_6=\frac{\kappa g_6}{\sqrt{2}\Omega_3}e^{-\phi_0/2}. \tag{3.48}$$

It follows that the mass per unit 5-volume now saturates a bound involving the magnetic charge

$$\mathcal{M}_6=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\mid g_6\mid e^{-\phi_0/2}. \tag{3.49}$$

Note that the ϕ_0 dependence is such that $\mathcal{M}_6$ is large for small $\mathcal{M}_2$ and vice-versa.

The electric charge of the elementary solution and the magnetic charge of the soliton solution obey a Dirac quantization rule [102, 103]

$$e_2 g_6 = 2\pi n, \qquad n = \text{integer}, \tag{3.50}$$

and hence

$$g_6 = 2\pi n/\sqrt{2}\kappa T_2. \tag{3.51}$$

3.3 Type II solutions, D-branes and black branes

Let us begin in $D = 10$ with Type IIA supergravity, whose bosonic action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} I_{10}(IIA) &= \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\int d^{10}x\sqrt{-g}\Big[R - \frac{1}{2}\,(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2.3!}\,e^{-\phi}{F_3}^2 - \frac{1}{2.2!}\,e^{3\phi/2}{F_2}^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2.4!}\,e^{\phi/2}{F_4'}^2\Big] - \frac{1}{4\kappa^2}\int F_4\wedge F_4\wedge A_2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

where

$$F_4' = dA_3 + A_1\wedge F_3. \tag{3.53}$$

Both the elementary string ($d = 2$) and fivebrane ($d = 6$) solutions of $N = 1$ supergravity described above continue to provide solutions to Type IIA supergravity, as may be seen by setting $F_2 = F_4 = 0$ [101, 68, 69]. [This observation is not as obvious as it may seem in the case of the elementary fivebranes or solitonic strings, however, since it assumes that one may dualize F_3. Now the Type IIA action follows by dimensional reduction from the action of $D = 11$ supergravity which contains F_4. There exists no dual of this action in which F_4 is replaced by F_7 essentially because A_3 appears explicitly in the Chern-Simons term $F_4\wedge F_4\wedge A_3$ [104]. Since F_4 and F_3 in $D = 10$ originate from F_4 in $D = 11$, this means that we cannot *simultaneously* dualize F_3 and F_4 but one may do either *separately*. By partial integration one may choose to have no explicit A_3 dependence in the Chern-Simons term or no explicity A_2 dependence, but not both.] Furthermore, by setting $F_2 = F_3 = 0$ we find elementary membrane ($d = 3$) and solitonic fourbrane ($\tilde{d} = 5$) solutions, and then by dualizing F_4, elementary fourbrane ($d = 5$) and solitonic membrane ($\tilde{d} = 3$) solutions. Finally, by setting $F_3 = F_4 = 0$, we find elementary particle ($d = 1$) and solitonic sixbrane ($\tilde{d} = 7$) solutions and then by dualizing F_2, elementary sixbrane ($d = 7$) and solitonic particle ($\tilde{d} = 1$) solutions [72].

Next we consider Type IIB supergravity in $D = 10$ whose bosonic sector consists of the graviton g_{MN}, a complex scalar ϕ, a complex 2-form A_2 (i.e with $d = 2$ or, by duality $d = 6$) and a real 4-form A_4 (i.e with $d = 4$ which in $D = 10$ is self-dual). Because of this self-duality of the 5-form field strength F_5, there exists no covariant action principle. Nevertheless we can apply the same logic to the equations of motion and we find that the solution again falls into the generic category. First of all, by truncation it is easy to see that the same string ($d = 2$) and fivebrane ($d = 6$) solutions of $N = 1$ supergravity continue to solve the field equations of Type IIB [68, 69]. On the other hand, if we set to zero F_3 and solve the self-duality condition $F_5 = -{}^*F_5$ then we find the self-dual superthreebrane [70] discussed in more detail below.

All of the above elementary and solitonic solutions satisfy the mass = charge condition. Our next task is to check for supersymmetry. We begin by making the same ansatz as in sections (3.1) and (3.2), but this time substitute into the supersymmetry transformation rules rather than the field equations, and demand unbroken supersymmetry. This reduces the four unknown functions A, B, C and ϕ to one. We then compare the results with the known solutions.

For Type IIA supergravity with vanishing fermion background, the gravitino transformation rule is

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\psi_M = D_M\varepsilon + \frac{1}{64}\, e^{3\phi/4}(\Gamma_M{}^{M_1M_2} - 14\delta_M{}^{M_1}\Gamma^{M_2})\Gamma^{11}\varepsilon F_{M_1M_2} \\ + \frac{1}{96}\, e^{-\phi/2}(\Gamma_M{}^{M_1M_2M_3} - 9\delta_M{}^{M_1}\Gamma^{M_2M_3})\Gamma^{11}\varepsilon F_{M_1M_2M_3} \\ + \frac{i}{256}\, e^{\phi/4}(\Gamma_M{}^{M_1M_2M_3M_4} - \frac{20}{3}\,\delta_M{}^{M_1}\Gamma^{M_2M_3M_4})\varepsilon F_{M_1M_2M_3M_4}\end{aligned} \tag{3.54}$$

and the dilatino rule is

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\lambda = \frac{1}{4}\,\sqrt{2}\, D_M\phi\Gamma^M\Gamma^{11}\varepsilon + \frac{3}{16}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\, e^{3\phi/4}\Gamma^{M_1M_2}\varepsilon F_{M_1M_2} \\ + \frac{1}{24}\,\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\, e^{-\phi/2}\Gamma^{M_1M_2M_3}\varepsilon F_{M_1M_2M_3} - \frac{1}{192}\,\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\, e^{\phi/4}\Gamma^{M_1M_2M_3M_4}\varepsilon F_{M_1M_2M_3M_4}\end{aligned} \tag{3.55}$$

where Γ^M are the $D = 10$ Dirac matrices, where the covariant derivative is given by

$$D_M = \partial_M + \frac{1}{4}\,\omega_{MAB}\Gamma^{AB} \tag{3.56}$$

with ω_{MAB} the Lorentz spin connection, where

$$\Gamma^{M_1M_2\ldots M_n} = \Gamma^{[M_1}\Gamma^{M_2}\ldots\Gamma^{M_n]} \tag{3.57}$$

and where

$$\Gamma^{11} = i\Gamma^0\Gamma^1\ldots\Gamma^9. \tag{3.58}$$

Similarly the Type IIB rules are

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\psi_M = D_M\varepsilon + \frac{i}{4\times 480}\,\Gamma^{M_1M_2M_3M_4}\Gamma_M\varepsilon F_{M_1M_2M_3M_4} \\ +\frac{1}{96}\,(\Gamma_M{}^{M_1M_2M_3} - 9\delta_M{}^{M_1}\Gamma^{M_2M_3})\varepsilon^* F_{M_1M_2M_3}\end{aligned} \tag{3.59}$$

and

$$\delta\lambda = i\Gamma^M\varepsilon^* P_M - \frac{1}{24}\,i\Gamma^{M_1M_2M_3}\varepsilon F_{M_1M_2M_3} \tag{3.60}$$

where

$$P_M = \partial_M\phi/(1-\phi^*\phi). \tag{3.61}$$

In the Type IIB case, ε is chiral

$$\Gamma_{11}\varepsilon = \varepsilon. \tag{3.62}$$

The requirement of unbroken supersymmetry is that there exist Killing spinors ε for which both $\delta\psi_M$ and $\delta\lambda$ vanish. Substituting our ansatze into the transformation rules we find that for every $1 \le d \le 7$ there exist field configurations which break exactly half the supersymmetries. This is just what one expects for supersymmetric extended object solutions and is intimately related to the kappa symmetry discussed in section (1.8) and the Bogomoln'yi bounds. The important observation [72] is that the values of A, B and ϕ in terms of C required by supersymmetry also solve the field equations. Thus in addition to the $D = 10$ super $(d-1)$ branes already known to exist for $d = 2$ (Heterotic, Type IIA and Type IIB), $d = 4$ (Type IIB only) and $d = 6$ (Heterotic,Type IIA and Type IIB), we establish the existence of a Type IIA superparticle ($d = 1$), a Type IIA supermembrane ($d = 3$), a Type IIA superfourbrane ($d = 5$) and a Type IIA supersixbrane ($d = 7$) [72].

It is perhaps worth saying a few more words about the self-dual superthreebrane. By virtue of the (anti) self-duality condition $F_5 = -{}^*F_5$, the electric Noether charge coincides with the topological magnetic charge

$$e_4 = -g_4. \tag{3.63}$$

(Note that such a condition is possible only in theories allowing a real self-duality condition i.e. in 2 mod 4 dimensions, assuming Minkowski signature. The self-dual string of [63] is another example.)

Finally we count bosonic and fermionic zero modes. We know that one half of the supersymmetries are broken, hence we have 16 fermionic zero modes. Regrouping these 16 fermionic zero modes, we get four Majorana spinors in $d = 4$. Hence the $d = 4$ worldvolume supersymmetry is $N = 4$. Worldvolume supersymmetry implies that the number of fermionic and bosonic on-shell degrees of freedom must be equal, so we need a total of eight bosonic zero modes. There are the usual six bosonic translation zero modes, but we are still short of two. The two extra zero modes come from the excitation of the complex antisymmetric field strength G_{MNP}. The equation of motion for small fluctuations of the two-form potential b in the soliton background is

$$D^P G_{MNP} = -\frac{i}{6}\, F_{MNPQR} G^{PQR}. \tag{3.64}$$

This is solved by

$$b = e^{ik\cdot x} E \wedge de^{2A}, \tag{3.65}$$

$$G = db + i * (db), \tag{3.66}$$

where k is a null vector in the two Lorentzian dimensions tangent to the worldvolume. E is a constant polarization vector orthogonal to k but tangent to the worldvolume and $*$ the Hodge dual in the worldvolume directions. Although G is a complex tensor, the zero-modes solution gives only one real vector field on the worldvolume which provides the other two zero modes. These two zero modes turn out to be pure gauge at zero worldvolume momentum. Together with the other zero modes, these fields make up the $d = 4, N = 4$ matter supermultiplet $(A_\mu, \lambda^I, \phi^{[IJ]})$.

For all these solutions, the mass per unit p-volume was given by the charge, as a consequence of the preservation half of the spacetime supersymmetry. However, it was recognized [72] that they were in fact just the extremal mass=charge limit of more general non-supersymmetric solutions found previously [105]. These solutions, whose mass was greater than their charge, exhibit *event horizons*: surfaces from which nothing, not even light, can escape. They were *black* branes!

Thus another by-product of these developments has been an appreciation of the role played by black holes in particle physics and string theory. In fact they can be regarded as black branes wrapped around the compactified dimensions [79, 106, 107]. These black holes are tiny (10^{-35} meters) objects; not the multi-million solar mass objects that are gobbling up galaxies. However, the same physics applies to both and there are strong hints that

M-theory may even clear up many of the apparent paradoxes of quantum black holes [21] raised by Hawking.

One of the biggest unsolved mysteries in string theory is why there seem to be billions of different ways of compactifying the string from ten dimensions to four and hence billions of competing predictions of the real world (which is like having no predictions at all). Remarkably, Greene, Morrison and Strominger [108] have shown that these wrappped around black branes actually connect one Calabi-Yau vacuum to another. This holds promise of a dynamical mechanism that would explain why the world is as it is, in other words, why we live in one particular vacuum.

Furthermore, the D-brane technology has opened up a whole new chapter in the history of supermembranes. In particular, it has enabled Strominger and Vafa [109] to make a comparison of the black hole entropy calculated from the degeneracy of wrapped-around black brane states with the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of an extreme black hole. Their agreement provided the first microscopic explanation of black hole entropy. Moreover, as Townsend [17] had shown earlier, the extreme black hole solutions of the ten-dimensional Type IIA string (in other words, the Dirichlet 0-branes) were just the Kaluza-Klein particles associated with wrapping the eleven-dimensional membrane around a circle. Moreover, four-dimensional black holes also admit the interpretation of intersecting membranes and fivebranes in eleven-dimensions [110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 117]. All this holds promise of a deeper understanding of black hole physics via supermembranes.

3.4 Membranes and fivebranes in $D = 11$

In [115], the supermembrane was recovered as an elementary solution of $D = 11$ supergravity which preserves half of the spacetime supersymmetry . Making the three/eight split $X^M = (x^\mu, y^m)$ where $\mu = 0, 1, 2$ and $m = 3, ..., 10$, the metric is given by

$$ds^2 = (1 + k_3/y^6)^{-2/3} dx^\mu dx_\mu + (1 + k_3/y^6)^{1/3}(dy^2 + y^2 d\Omega_7{}^2) \tag{3.67}$$

and the four-form field strength by

$$\tilde{K}_7 \equiv *K_4 = 6k_3\epsilon_7 \tag{3.68}$$

where the constant k_3 is given by

$$k_3 = \frac{2\kappa_{11}{}^2 T_3}{\Omega_7} \tag{3.69}$$

Here ϵ_7 is the volume form on S^7 and Ω_7 is the volume. The mass per unit area of the membrane $\mathcal{M}_3$ is equal to its tension:

$$\mathcal{M}_3 = T_3 \tag{3.70}$$

This *elementary* solution is a singular solution of the supergravity equations coupled to a supermembrane source and carries a Noether "electric" charge

$$Q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\kappa_{11}} \int_{S^7} (*K_4 + C_3 \wedge K_4) = \sqrt{2}\kappa_{11} T_3 \tag{3.71}$$

Hence the solution saturates the Bogomol'nyi bound $\sqrt{2}\kappa_{11}\mathcal{M}_3 \geq Q$. This is a consequence of the preservation of half the supersymmetries which is also intimately linked with the worldvolume kappa symmetry. The zero modes of this solution belong to a $(d = 3, n = 8)$ supermultiplet consisting of eight scalars and eight spinors (ϕ^I, χ^I), with $I = 1, ..., 8$, which correspond to the eight Goldstone bosons and their superpartners associated with breaking of the eight translations transverse to the membrane worldvolume.

In [71], the superfivebrane was discovered as a soliton solution of $D = 11$ supergravity also preserving half the spacetime supersymmetry . Making the six/five split $X^M = (x^\mu, y^m)$ where $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ and $m = 6, ..., 10$, the metric is given by

$$ds^2 = (1 + k_6/y^3)^{-1/3} dx^\mu dx_\mu + (1 + k_6/y^3)^{2/3}(dy^2 + y^2 d{\Omega_4}^2) \tag{3.72}$$

and the four-index field-strength by

$$K_4 = 3k_6\epsilon_4 \tag{3.73}$$

where the fivebrane tension $\tilde{T}_6$ is related to the constant k_6 by

$$k_6 = \frac{2{\kappa_{11}}^2 \tilde{T}_6}{3\Omega_4} \tag{3.74}$$

Here ϵ_4 is the volume form on S^4 and Ω_4 is the volume. The mass per unit 5-volume of the fivebrane $\mathcal{M}_6$ is equal to its tension:

$$\mathcal{M}_6 = \tilde{T}_6 \tag{3.75}$$

This *solitonic* solution is a non-singular solution of the source-free equations and carries a topological "magnetic" charge

$$P = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\kappa_{11}} \int_{S^4} K_4 = \sqrt{2}\kappa_{11}\tilde{T}_6 \tag{3.76}$$

Hence the solution saturates the Bogomol'nyi bound $\sqrt{2}\kappa_{11}\mathcal{M}_6 \geq P$. Once again, this is a consequence of the preservation of half the supersymmetries. The kappa covariant action (or even field equations) for this $D = 11$ superfivebrane is still unknown (see [118, 42] for recent progress) but consideration of the soliton zero modes [116, 27, 17] means that the gauged fixed action must be described by the same chiral antisymmetric tensor multiplet $(B^{-}{}_{\mu\nu}, \lambda^I, \phi^{[IJ]})$ as that of the Type IIA fivebrane [68, 69]. Note that in addition to the five scalars corresponding to the five translational Goldstone bosons, there is also a 2-form $B^{-}{}_{\mu\nu}$ whose 3-form field strength is anti-self dual and which describes three degrees of freedom.

The electric and magnetic charges obey a Dirac quantization rule [102, 103]

$$QP = 2\pi n \qquad n = \text{integer} \tag{3.77}$$

Or, in terms of the tensions [119, 63],

$$2{\kappa_{11}}^2 T_3 \tilde{T}_6 = 2\pi n \tag{3.78}$$

This naturally suggests a $D = 11$ membrane/fivebrane duality. Note that this reduces the three dimensionful parameters T_3, $\tilde{T}_6$ and κ_{11} to two. Moreover, it was recently shown [14] that they are not independent. To see this, we note from (2.2) that C_3 has period $2\pi/T_3$ so that K_4 is quantized according to

$$\int K_4 = \frac{2\pi n}{T_3} \quad n = integer \tag{3.79}$$

Consistency of such C_3 periods with the spacetime action, (1.33), gives the relation

$$\frac{(2\pi)^2}{{\kappa_{11}}^2 T_3^3} \in 2Z \tag{3.80}$$

From (3.78), this may also be written as

$$2\pi \frac{\tilde{T}_6}{{T_3}^2} \in Z \tag{3.81}$$

Thus the tension of the singly charged fivebrane is given by

$$\tilde{T}_6 = \frac{1}{2\pi} {T_3}^2 \tag{3.82}$$

in agreement [120] with the D-brane derivation [19].

Having obtained these solitons in ten and eleven dimensions, a bewildering array of other solitonic p-branes may be obtained by vertical and diagonal dimensional reduction [27, 121, 122]

4 Duality

4.1 String/fivebrane duality: good news and bad

The 3-form version of $D = 10, N = 1$ supergravity admits the elementary string as a solution [101]. Here we shall show that the 7-form version admits the elementary fivebrane as a solution [119]. The elementary string can also be interpreted as a magnetic-like solution of the 7-form version, as can the elementary fivebrane for the 3-form version. This suggests that the heterotic string and the heterotic fivebrane may be dual to each other in the sense that they are equivalent descriptions of the same underlying physical theory. In the dual formulation, the metric g_{MN} and the dilaton ϕ are the same, whereas the 7-form field strength K of the fivebrane is dual to the 3-form field strength of the string H. More precisely,

$$H = e^{\phi *} K, \tag{4.1}$$

where * denotes the Hodge dual using the canonical metric, so that the field equation of the 3-form becomes the Bianchi identity of the 7-form and vice-versa. Hence

$$I_{10}(\text{fivebrane}) = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-g} (R - \frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2 \cdot 7!} e^{\phi} K^2), \tag{4.2}$$

where K is the curl of the 6-form A:

$$K = dA. \tag{4.3}$$

String/fivebrane duality will tell us that the fivebrane loop coupling constant g_6 is given by the inverse cube root of the string loop coupling constant g_2,

$$\mathrm{g}_6 = \mathrm{g}_2^{-1/3} = e^{-\phi_0/3}, \tag{4.4}$$

which implies that the strongly coupled heterotic string corresponds to the weakly coupled fivebrane, and vice versa. We will now derive (4.4) and the following relations between the canonical gravitational metric and the metrics which appear naturally in the string and fivebrane σ-models:

$$g_{MN}(\text{canonical}) = e^{-\phi/2} g_{MN}(\text{string}) = e^{\phi/6} g_{MN}(\text{fivebrane}). \tag{4.5}$$

In general, we have

$$g_{MN}(\text{string}) = \Omega_s(\phi) g_{MN}(\text{canonical}), \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$g_{MN}(\text{fivebrane}) = \Omega_f(\phi) g_{MN}(\text{canonical}). \tag{4.7}$$

The corresponding lowest-order σ-model actions written in terms of the canonical metric are given by

$$S_2 = -T_2 \int d^2\xi (\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N \Omega_s(\phi) g_{MN} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N B_{MN}), \tag{4.8}$$

for the string and

$$S_6 = -T_6 \int d^6\xi (\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N \Omega_f(\phi) g_{MN} - 2\sqrt{-\gamma}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{6!}\varepsilon^{ijklmn}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N \partial_k X^O \partial_l X^P \partial_m X^Q \partial_n X^R A_{MNOPQR}) \tag{4.9}$$

for the fivebrane. Note that in this case

$$\gamma_{ij} = \partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N \Omega_f(\phi) g_{MN}. \tag{4.10}$$

To fix Ω_s and Ω_f, consider the following two parameter constant rescalings

$$g_{MN} \to \lambda^{1/2}\sigma^{3/2}\ g_{MN}, \tag{4.11}$$

$$e^{\phi} \to \lambda^3 \sigma^{-3} e^{\phi}, \tag{4.12}$$

$$B_{MN} \to \lambda^2 B_{MN}, \tag{4.13}$$

$$A_{MNOPQR} \to \sigma^6 A_{MNOPQR}. \tag{4.14}$$

Provided we choose

$$\Omega_s(\phi) = e^{\phi/2}, \qquad \Omega_f(\phi) = e^{-\phi/6}, \tag{4.15}$$

then the actions have the required homogeneous scaling

$$I_{10}(\text{string/fivebrane}) \to \lambda^2\sigma^{-6} I_{10}(\text{string/fivebrane}), \tag{4.16}$$

$$S_2 \to \lambda^2 S_2, \tag{4.17}$$

$$S_6 \to \sigma^6 S_6, \tag{4.18}$$

This result agrees with what one obtains in string theory by setting the β-functions of g_{MN}, B_{MN} and ϕ to zero, i.e. by using string worldsheet conformal invariance.

We are now ready to derive (4.4). This can be achieved simply by writing I_{10}(string) and I_{10}(fivebrane) in terms of string and fivebrane metrics given in (4.5), respectively. We obtain for the string action

$$I_{10}(\text{string}) = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\int d^{10}x\sqrt{-g}e^{-2\phi}(R + 4(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2\cdot 3!}H^2), \tag{4.19}$$

where the common factor $e^{-2\phi}$ for each term implies that the string loop counting parameter g_2 is given by

$$\mathrm{g}_2 = e^{\phi_0}. \tag{4.20}$$

For the fivebrane action,

$$I_{10}(\text{fivebrane}) = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\int d^{10}x\sqrt{-g}e^{2\phi/3}(R - \frac{1}{2\cdot 7!}K^2), \tag{4.21}$$

and an analogous situation arises, namely a common factor $e^{2\phi/3}$ in front of each term. In analogy with the case of the string, the common factor suggests that the fivebrane loop counting parameter g_6 is given by

$$\mathrm{g}_6 = e^{-\phi_0/3}. \tag{4.22}$$

String/fivebrane duality was now much more closely mimicking the electric/magnetic duality of Montonen and Olive [100]. However, since most physicists were already sceptical of electric/magnetic duality in four dimensions, they did not immediately embrace string/fivebrane duality in ten dimensions!

Furthermore, there was one major problem with treating the fivebrane as a fundamental object in its own right; a problem that has bedevilled supermembrane theory right from the beginning: no-one knows how to quantize fundamental p-branes with $p > 2$. All the techniques that worked so well for fundamental strings and which allow us, for example, to calculate how one string scatters off another, simply do not go through. Problems arise both at the level of the worldvolume equations where the *bete noir* of non-renormalizability comes to haunt us and also at the level of the spacetime equations. Each term in string perturbation theory corresponds to a two-dimensional worldsheet with more and more holes: we must sum over all topologies of the worldsheet. But for surfaces with more than two dimensions we do not know how to do this. Indeed, there are powerful theorems in pure mathematics which tell you that it is not merely hard but impossible. In any case, the quantities that are light in the limit of weak coupling are particles and strings but not branes with $p \geq 2$ [126]. So there were two major impediments to string/fivebrane duality in 10 dimensions. First, the

electric/magnetic duality analogy was ineffective so long as most physicists were sceptical of this duality. Secondly, treating fivebranes as fundamental raised all the unresolved issues of quantization.

4.2 String/string duality in $D = 6$

The first of these impediments was removed, however, when Sen [127] revitalized the Olive-Montonen conjecture by establishing that certain dyonic states, which their conjecture demanded, were indeed present in the theory. Many duality sceptics were thus converted. Indeed this inspired Seiberg and Witten [128] to look for duality in more realistic (though still supersymmetric) approximations to the standard model. The subsequent industry, known as Seiberg-Witten theory, provided a wealth of new information on non-perturbative effects in four-dimensional quantum field theories, such as quark-confinement and symmetry-breaking, which would have been unthinkable just a few years ago.

As for the second problem of fundamental fivebranes, recall that when wrapped around a circle, an 11-dimensional membrane behaves as if it were a 10-dimensional string. In a series of papers [131, 132, 63, 133, 106, 27, 65, 14] between 1991 and 1995, Duff, Khuri, Liu, Lu, Minasian and Rahmfeld argued that this may also be the way out of the problems of 10-dimensional string/fivebrane duality. If we allow four of the ten dimensions to be curled up and allow the solitonic fivebrane to wrap around them, it will behave as if it were a 6-dimensional solitonic string! The fundamental string will remain a fundamental string but now also in 6-dimensions. So the 10-dimensional string/fivebrane duality conjecture gets replaced by a 6-dimensional string/string duality conjecture. The obvious advantage is that, in contrast to the fivebrane, we do know how to quantize the string and hence we can put the predictions of string/string duality to the test. For example, one can show that the coupling constant of the solitonic string is indeed given by the inverse of the fundamental string's coupling constant, in complete agreement with the conjecture.

When we spoke of string/string duality, we originally had in mind a duality between one heterotic string and another, but the next major development in the subject came in 1994 when Hull and Townsend [16] suggested that, if the four-dimensional compact space is chosen suitably, a six-dimensional heterotic string can be dual to a six-dimensional Type IIA string!

Evidence in favor of the idea that the physics of the fundamental string in six spacetime

dimensions may equally well be described by a dual string and that one emerges as a soliton solution of the other [131, 63, 133, 65, 134, 135] goes as follows. The string equations admits the singular *elementary* string solution [101]

$$ds^2 = (1 - k^2/r^2)[-d\tau^2 + d\sigma^2 + (1 - k^2/r^2)^{-2}dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_3{}^2]$$

$$e^{\Phi} = 1 - k^2/r^2$$

$$e^{-\Phi} * H_3 = 2k^2\epsilon_3 \tag{4.23}$$

where

$$k^2 = \kappa^2 T/\Omega_3 \tag{4.24}$$

$T = 1/2\pi\alpha'$ is the string tension, Ω_3 is the volume of S^3 and ϵ_3 is the volume form. It describes an infinitely long string whose worldsheet lies in the plane $X^0 = \tau, X^1 = \sigma$. Its mass per unit length is given by

$$M = T < e^{\Phi/2} > \tag{4.25}$$

and is thus heavier for stronger string coupling, as one would expect for a fundamental string. The string equations also admit the non-singular *solitonic* string solution [63, 133]

$$ds^2 = -d\tau^2 + d\sigma^2 + (1 - \tilde{k}^2/r^2)^{-2}dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_3{}^2$$

$$e^{-\Phi} = 1 - \tilde{k}^2/r^2$$

$$H_3 = 2\tilde{k}^2\epsilon_3 \tag{4.26}$$

whose tension $\tilde{T} = 1/2\pi\tilde{\alpha}'$ is given by

$$\tilde{k}^2 = \kappa^2\tilde{T}/\Omega_3 \tag{4.27}$$

Its mass per unit length is given by

$$\tilde{M} = \tilde{T} < e^{-\Phi/2} > \tag{4.28}$$

and is thus heavier for weaker string coupling, as one would expect for a solitonic string. Thus we see that the solitonic string differs from the fundamental string by the replacements

$$\Phi \to \tilde{\Phi} = -\Phi$$

$$G_{MN} \to \tilde{G}_{MN} = e^{-\Phi}G_{MN}$$

$$H \to \tilde{H} = e^{-\Phi} * H$$

$$\alpha' \to \tilde{\alpha}' \tag{4.29}$$

The Dirac quantization rule $eg = 2\pi n$ (n=integer) relating the Noether "electric" charge

$$e = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\kappa} \int_{S^3} e^{-\Phi} * H_3 \tag{4.30}$$

to the topological "magnetic" charge

$$g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\kappa} \int_{S^3} H_3 \tag{4.31}$$

translates into a quantization condition on the two tensions:

$$2\kappa^2 = n(2\pi)^3 \alpha' \tilde{\alpha}' \quad n = integer \tag{4.32}$$

where κ is the six-dimensional gravitational constant. (However, one may, by siutable choice of units, set the two tensions equal [141].) Both the string and dual string soliton solutions break half the supersymmetries, both saturate a Bogomol'nyi bound between the mass and the charge. These solutions are the extreme mass equals charge limit of more general two-parameter black string solutions [105, 63].

We now make the major assumption of string/string duality: the dual string may be regarded as a fundamental string in its own right with a worldsheet action that couples to the dual variables and has the dual tension given in (4.29). It follows that the dual string equations admit the dual string (4.26) as the fundamental solution and the fundamental string (4.23) as the dual solution. When expressed in terms of the dual metric, however, the former is singular and the latter non-singular. It also follows from (4.32) that in going from the fundamental string to the dual string and interchanging α' with $\tilde{\alpha}' = 2\kappa^2/(2\pi)^3\alpha'$, one also interchanges the roles of worldsheet and spacetime loop expansions. Moreover, since the dilaton enters the dual string equations with the opposite sign to the fundamental string, it was argued in [131, 63, 133] that in $D = 6$ the strong coupling regime of the string should correspond to the weak coupling regime of the dual string:

$$\mathrm{g_6}^2/(2\pi)^3 = < e^{\Phi} > = (2\pi)^3/\tilde{\mathrm{g}}_6^2 \tag{4.33}$$

where $\mathrm{g_6}$ and $\tilde{\mathrm{g}}_6$ are the six-dimensional string and dual string loop expansion parameters.

5 Electric/Magnetic Duality from String/String Duality

5.1 S duality and T duality

In 1977 Montonen and Olive [100], made a bold conjecture. Might there exist a *dual* formulation of fundamental physics in which the roles of Noether charges and topological charges are reversed? In such a dual picture, the magnetic monopoles would be the fundamental objects and the quarks, W-bosons and Higgs particles would be the solitons! They were inspired by the observation that in certain *supersymmetric* gauge theories, the masses M of all the particles whether elementary (carrying purely electric charge Q), solitonic (carrying purely magnetic charge P) or dyonic (carrying both) are described by a universal formula

$$M^2 = v^2(Q^2 + P^2) \tag{5.1}$$

where v is a constant. Note that the mass formula remains unchanged if we exchange the roles of P and Q! The Montonen-Olive conjecture was that this electric/magnetic symmetry is a symmetry not merely of the mass formula but is an exact symmetry of the entire quantum theory! The reason why this idea remained merely a conjecture rather than a proof has to do with the whole question of perturbative versus non-perturbative effects. According to Dirac, the electric charge Q is quantized in units of e, the charge on the electron, whereas the magnetic charge is quantized in units of $1/e$. In other words, $Q = me$ and $P = n/e$, where m and n are integers. The symmetry suggested by Olive and Montonen thus demanded that in the dual world, we not only exchange the integers m and n but we also replace e by $1/e$ and go from a regime of weak coupling to a regime of strong coupling!

The Olive-Montonen conjecture was originally intended to apply to four-dimensional grand unified field theories. In 1990, however, Font, Ibanez, Lust and Quevedo [136] and, independently, Rey [137] generalized the idea to four-dimensional superstrings, where in fact the idea becomes even more natural and goes by the name of S-duality. In fact, superstring theorists had already become used to a totally different kind of duality called T-duality [169]. Unlike, S-duality which was a non-perturbative symmetry and hence still speculative, T-duality was a perturbative symmetry and rigorously established. If we compactify a string theory on a circle then, in addition to the Kaluza-Klein particles we would expect in an ordinary field theory, there are also extra *winding* particles that arise because a string can

wind around the circle. T-duality states that nothing changes if we exchange the roles of the Kaluza-Klein and winding particles provided we also exchange the radius of the circle R by its inverse $1/R$. In short, a string cannnot tell the difference between a big circle and a small one!

5.2 Duality of dualities

String/string duality now has another unexpected pay-off [65]. If we compactify the six-dimensional spacetime on two circles down to four dimensions, the fundamental string and the solitonic string will each acquire a T-duality. But here is the miracle: the T-duality of the solitonic string is just the S-duality of the fundamental string, and vice-versa! This phenomenon, in which the non-perturbative replacement of e by $1/e$ in one picture is just the perturbative replacement of R by $1/R$ in the dual picture, goes by the name of *Duality of Dualities*. Thus four-dimensional electric/magnetic duality, which was previously only a conjecture, now emerges automatically if we make the more primitive conjecture of six-dimensional string/string duality.

To see this, we begin by recalling that when we include a non-vanishing theta angle, the S-duality is desribed by $SL(2,Z)$. The conjectured $SL(2,Z)$ symmetry acts on the gauge coupling constant e and theta angle θ via:

$$S \to \frac{aS+b}{cS+d} \tag{5.2}$$

where a, b, c, d are integers satisfying $ad - bc = 1$ and where

$$S = S_1 + iS_2 = \frac{\theta}{2\pi} + i\frac{4\pi}{e^2} \tag{5.3}$$

This is also called electric/magnetic duality because the integers m and n which characterize the magnetic charges $Q_m = n/e$ and electric charges $Q_e = e(m + n\theta/2\pi)$ of the particle spectrum transform as

$$\begin{pmatrix} m \\ n \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} m \\ n \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.4}$$

Such a symmetry would be inherently non-perturbative since, for $\theta = 0$ and with $a = d = 0$ and $b = -c = -1$, it reduces to the strong/weak coupling duality

$$e^2/4\pi \to 4\pi/e^2$$

$$n \to m, m \to -n \tag{5.5}$$

This in turn means that the coupling constant cannot get renormalized in perturbation theory and hence that the renormalization group β-function vanishes

$$\beta(e) = 0 \tag{5.6}$$

This is guaranteed in $N = 4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills and also happens in certain $N = 2$ theories. Thus the duality idea is that the theory may equivalently be described in one of two ways. In the conventional way, the W-bosons, Higgs bosons and their fermionic partners are the electrically charged elementary particles and the magnetic monopoles emerge as soliton solutions of the field equations. In the dual description, however, it is the monopoles which are elementary and the electrically charged particles which emerge as the solitons.

In string theory the roles of the theta angle θ and coupling constant e are played by the VEVs of the the four-dimensional axion field a and dilaton field η:

$$< a >= \frac{\theta}{2\pi} \tag{5.7}$$

$$e^2/4\pi =< e^{\eta} >= 8G/\alpha' \tag{5.8}$$

Here G is Newton's constant and $2\pi\alpha'$ is the inverse string tension. Hence S-duality (5.2) now becomes a transformation law for the axion/dilaton field S:

$$S = S_1 + iS_2 = \mathrm{a} + ie^{-\eta} \tag{5.9}$$

Let us first consider T-duality and focus just on the moduli fields that arise in compactification on a 2-torus of a $D = 6$ string with dilaton Φ, metric G_{MN} and 2-form potential B_{MN} with 3-form field strength H_{MNP}. Here the T-duality is just $O(2, 2; Z)$. Let us parametrize the compactified $(m, n = 4, 5)$ components of string metric and 2-form as

$$G_{mn} = e^{\rho-\sigma} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\rho} + c^2 & -c \\ -c & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.10}$$

and

$$B_{mn} = b\epsilon_{mn} \tag{5.11}$$

The four-dimensional shifted dilaton η is given by

$$e^{-\eta} = e^{-\Phi}\sqrt{detG_{mn}} = e^{-\Phi-\sigma} \tag{5.12}$$

and the axion field a is defined by

$$\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\partial_\sigma \mathrm{a} = \sqrt{-g}e^{-\eta}g^{\mu\sigma}g^{\nu\lambda}g^{\rho\tau}H_{\sigma\lambda\tau} \tag{5.13}$$

where $g_{\mu\nu} = G_{\mu\nu}$ and $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$. We further define the complex Kahler form field T and the complex structure field U by

$$T = T_1 + iT_2 = b + ie^{-\sigma}$$

$$U = U_1 + iU_2 = c + ie^{-\rho} \tag{5.14}$$

Thus this T-duality may be written as

$$O(2,2;Z)_{TU} \sim SL(2,Z)_T \times SL(2,Z)_U \tag{5.15}$$

where $SL(2,Z)_T$ acts on the T-field and $SL(2,Z)_U$ acts on the U-field in the same way that $SL(2,Z)_S$ acts on the S-field in (5.2). In contrast to $SL(2,Z)_S$, $SL(2,Z)_T \times SL(2,Z)_U$ is known to be an exact string symmetry order by order in string perturbation theory. $SL(2,Z)_T$ does, however, contain a minimum/maximum length duality mathematically similar to (5.5)

$$R \to \alpha'/R \tag{5.16}$$

where R is the compactification scale given by

$$\alpha'/R^2 =< e^\sigma > . \tag{5.17}$$

Let us now investigate how both $N = 4$ and $N = 2$ exact electric/magnetic duality follows from string theory. There is a formal similarity between S-duality and T-duality. It was argued in [65] that these mathematical similarities between $SL(2,Z)_S$ and $SL(2,Z)_T$ are not coincidental. On compactification to four spacetime dimensions, the two theories appear very similar, each acquiring an $O(2,2;Z)$ target space duality. One's first guess might be to assume that the strongly coupled four-dimensional fundamental string corresponds to the weakly coupled dual string, but in fact something more subtle and interesting happens: the roles of the S and T fields are interchanged [132] so that the strong/weak coupling $SL(2,Z)_S$ of the fundamental string emerges as a subgroup of the target space duality of the dual string:

$$O(2,2;Z)_{SU} \sim SL(2,Z)_S \times SL(2,Z)_U \tag{5.18}$$

Table 6: Duality of dualities

	Fundamental string	*Dual string*
$T-duality$	$O(2,2;Z)_{TU}$	$O(2,2;Z)_{SU}$
	$\sim SL(2,Z)_T \times SL(2,Z)_U$	$\sim SL(2,Z)_S \times SL(2,Z)_U$
$Moduli$	$T = \mathrm{b} + ie^{-\sigma}$	$S = \mathrm{a} + ie^{-\eta}$
	$\mathrm{b} = B_{45}$	$\mathrm{a} = \tilde{B}_{45}$
	$e^{-\sigma} = \sqrt{detG_{mn}}$	$e^{-\eta} = \sqrt{det\tilde{G}_{mn}}$
$Worldsheet\, coupling$	$< e^{\sigma} >= \alpha'/R^2$	$< e^{\eta} >= \mathrm{g}^2/2\pi$
$Large/small\, radius$	$R \to \alpha'/R$	$\mathrm{g}^2/2\pi \to 2\pi/\mathrm{g}^2$
$S-duality$	$SL(2,Z)_S$	$SL(2,Z)_T$
$Axion/dilaton$	$S = \mathrm{a} + ie^{-\eta}$	$T = \mathrm{b} + ie^{-\sigma}$
	$d\mathrm{a} = e^{-\eta} * H$	$d\mathrm{b} = e^{-\sigma}\tilde{*}\tilde{H}$
	$e^{-\eta} = e^{-\Phi}\sqrt{detG_{mn}}$	$e^{-\sigma} = e^{\Phi}\sqrt{det\tilde{G}_{mn}}$
$Spacetime\, coupling$	$< e^{\eta} >= \mathrm{g}^2/2\pi$	$< e^{\sigma} >= \alpha'/R^2$
$Strong/weak\, coupling$	$\mathrm{g}^2/2\pi \to 2\pi/\mathrm{g}^2$	$R \to \alpha'/R$

This *duality of dualities* is summarized in Table 6. As a consistency check, we note that since $(2\pi R)^2/2\kappa^2 = 1/16\pi G$ the Dirac quantization rule (4.32) becomes (choosing n=1)

$$8GR^2 = \alpha'\tilde{\alpha}' \tag{5.19}$$

Invariance of this rule now requires that a strong-weak coupling transformation on the fundamental string ($8G/\alpha' \rightarrow \alpha'/8G$) must be accompanied by a minimum/maximum length transformation of the dual string ($\tilde{\alpha}'/R^2 \rightarrow R^2/\tilde{\alpha}'$), and vice versa.

6 String/String Duality from M Theory

All this previous work on T-duality, S-duality, and string/string duality was suddenly pulled together by Witten [18] under the umbrella of eleven-dimensions. One of the biggest problems with $D = 10$ string theory is that there are *five* consistent string theories: Type I $SO(32)$, heterotic $SO(32)$, heterotic $E_8 \times E_8$, Type IIA and Type IIB. As a candidate for a unique *theory of everything*, this is clearly an embarrassment of riches. Witten put forward a convincing case that this distinction is just an artifact of perturbation theory and that non-perturbatively these five theories are, in fact, just different corners of a deeper theory. Moreover, this deeper theory, subsequently dubbed *M-theory*, has $D = 11$ supergravity as its low energy limit! Thus the five string theories and $D = 11$ supergravity represent six different special points[7] in the moduli space of M-theory. The small parameters of perturbative string theory are provided by $< e^{\Phi} >$, where Φ is the dilaton field, and $< e^{\sigma_i} >$ where σ_i are the moduli fields which arise after compactification. What makes M-theory at once intriguing and yet difficult to analyse is that in $D = 11$ there is neither dilaton nor moduli and hence the theory is intrinsically non-perturbative. Consequently, the ultimate meaning of M-theory is still unclear, and Witten has suggested that in the meantime, M should stand for "Magic", "Mystery" or "Membrane", according to taste. Curiously enough, however, Witten still played down the importance of supermembranes. But it was only a matter of time before he too succumbed to the conclusion that we weren't doing just string theory any more! In the coming months, literally hundreds of papers appeared in the internet confirming

[7]Some authors take the phrase *M-theory* to refer merely to this sixth corner of the moduli space. With this definition, of course, M-theory is no more fundamental than the other five corners. For us, *M-theory* means the whole kit and caboodle.

that, whatever M-theory may be, it certainly involves supermembranes in an important way. For example, we shall now see how the 6-dimensional string/string duality of section (4.2) (and hence the 4-dimensional electric/magnetic duality of section (5.2)) follows from 11-dimensional membrane/fivebrane duality [163, 141]. The fundamental string is obtained by wrapping the membrane around a one-dimensional space and then compactifying on a four-dimensional space; whereas the solitonic string is obtained by wrapping the fivebrane around the four-dimensional space and then compactifying on the one-dimensional space. Nor did it take long before the more realistic kinds of electric/magnetic duality envisioned by Seiberg and Witten [128] were also given an explanation in terms of string/string duality and hence M-theory.

Even the chiral $E_8 \times E_8$ string, which according to Witten's earlier theorem could never come from eleven-dimensions, was given an eleven-dimensional explanation by Horava and Witten [93]. The no-go theorem is evaded by compactifying not on a circle (which has no ends), but on a line-segment (which has two ends). Witten went on to argue that if the size of this one-dimensional space is large compared to the six-dimensional Calabi-Yau manifold, then our world is approximately five-dimensional. This may have important consequences for confronting M-theory with experiment. For example, it is known that the strengths of the four forces change with energy. In supersymmetric extensions of the standard model, one finds that the fine structure constants $\alpha_3, \alpha_2, \alpha_1$ associated with the $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ all meet at about 10^{16} GeV, entirely consistent with the idea of grand unification. The strength of the dimensionless number $\alpha_G = GE^2$, where G is Newton's contant and E is the energy, also almost meets the other three, but not quite. This near miss has been a source of great interest, but also frustration. However, in a universe of the kind envisioned by Witten [139], spacetime is approximately a narrow five dimensional layer bounded by four-dimensional walls. The particles of the standard model live on the walls but gravity lives in the five-dimensional bulk. As a result, it is possible to choose the size of this fifth dimension so that all four forces meet at this common scale. Note that this is much less than the Planck scale of 10^{19} GeV, so gravitational effects may be much closer in energy than we previously thought; a result that would have all kinds of cosmological consequences.

Thus this eleven-dimensional framework now provides the starting point for understanding a wealth of new non-perturbative phenomena, including string/string duality, Seiberg-Witten theory, quark confinement, particle physics phenomenology and cosmology.

6.1 Membrane/fivebrane duality in $D = 11$

Let us consider M-theory, with its fundamental membrane and solitonic fivebrane, on $R^6 \times M_1 \times \tilde{M}_4$ where M_1 is a one-dimensional compact space of radius R and $\tilde{M}_4$ is a four-dimensional compact space of volume V. We may obtain a fundamental string on R^6 by wrapping the membrane around M_1 and reducing on $\tilde{M}_4$. Let us denote fundamental string sigma-model metrics in $D = 10$ and $D = 6$ by G_{10} and G_6. Then from the corresponding Einstein Lagrangians

$$\sqrt{-G_{11}}R_{11} = R^{-3}\sqrt{-G_{10}}R_{10} = \frac{V}{R}\sqrt{-G_6}R_6 \tag{6.1}$$

we may read off the strength of the string couplings in $D = 10$ [141]

$${\lambda_{10}}^2 = R^3 \tag{6.2}$$

and $D = 6$

$${\lambda_6}^2 = \frac{R}{V} \tag{6.3}$$

Similarly we may obtain a solitonic string on R^6 by wrapping the fivebrane around $\tilde{M}_4$ and reducing on M_1. Let us denote the solitonic string sigma-model metrics in $D = 7$ and $D = 6$ by $\tilde{G}_7$ and $\tilde{G}_6$. Then from the corresponding Einstein Lagrangians

$$\sqrt{-G_{11}}R_{11} = V^{-3/2}\sqrt{-\tilde{G}_7}\tilde{R}_7 = \frac{R}{V}\sqrt{-\tilde{G}_6}\tilde{R}_6 \tag{6.4}$$

we may read off the strength of the string couplings in $D = 7$ [141]

$$\tilde{\lambda}_7^2 = V^{3/2} \tag{6.5}$$

and $D = 6$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_6^2 = \frac{V}{R} \tag{6.6}$$

Thus we see that the fundamental and solitonic strings are related by a strong/weak coupling:

$$\tilde{\lambda}_6^2 = 1/{\lambda_6}^2 \tag{6.7}$$

We shall be interested in $M_1 = S^1$ in which case the fundamental string will be Type IIA or $M_1 = S^1/Z_2$ in which case the fundamental string will be heterotic $E_8 \times E_8$. Similarly, we will be interested in $\tilde{M}_4 = T^4$ in which case the solitonic string will be Type IIA or $\tilde{M}_4 = K3$ in which case the solitonic string will be heterotic. Thus there are four possible scenarios

Table 7: String/string duality

$(\mathbf{N}_+, \mathbf{N}_-)$	$\mathbf{M_1}$	$\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_\mathbf{4}$	**fundamental string**	**dual string**
$(1,0)$	S^1/Z_2	$K3$	*heterotic*	*heterotic*
$(1,1)$	S^1	$K3$	*Type IIA*	*heterotic*
$(1,1)$	S^1/Z_2	T^4	*heterotic*	*Type IIA*
$(2,2)$	S^1	T^4	*Type IIA*	*Type IIA*

which are summarized in Table 7. (N_+, N_-) denotes the $D = 6$ spacetime supersymmetries. In each case, the fundamental string will be weakly coupled as we shrink the size of the wrapping space M_1 and the dual string will be weakly coupled as we shrink the size of the wrapping space $\tilde{M}_4$.

In fact, there is in general a topological obstruction to wrapping the fivebrane around $\tilde{M}_4$ provided by (3.79) because the fivebrane cannot wrap around a 4-manifold that has $n \neq 0$[8]. This is because the anti-self-dual 3-form field strength T on the worldvolume of the fivebrane obeys [142, 164]

$$dT = K_4 \tag{6.8}$$

and the existence of a solution for T therefore requires that K_4 must be cohomologically trivial. For M-theory on $R^6 \times S^1/Z_2 \times T^4$ this is no problem. For M theory on $R^6 \times S^1/Z_2 \times K3$, with instanton number k in one E_8 and $24 - k$ in the other, however, the flux of K_4 over $K3$ is [141]

$$n = 12 - k \tag{6.9}$$

Consequently, the M-theoretic explanation of heterotic/heterotic duality requires $E_8 \times E_8$ with the symmetric embedding $k = 12$. This has some far-reaching implications. For example, the duality exchanges gauge fields that can be seen in perturbation theory with gauge fields of a non-perturbative origin [141].

The dilaton $\tilde{\Phi}$, the string σ-model metric $\tilde{G}_{MN}$ and 3-form field strength $\tilde{H}$ of the dual string are related to those of the fundamental string, Φ, G_{MN} and H by the replacements [63, 133]

$$\Phi \to \tilde{\Phi} = -\Phi$$

[8]Actually, as recently shown in [140], the object which must have integral periods is not $T_3 K_4/2\pi$ but rather $T_3 K_4/2\pi - p_1/4$ where p_1 is the first Pontryagin class. This will not affect our conclusions, however.

$$G_{MN} \to \tilde{G}_{MN} = e^{-\Phi} G_{MN}$$
$$H \to \tilde{H} = e^{-\Phi} * H \tag{6.10}$$

In the case of heterotic/Type IIA duality and Type IIA/heterotic duality, this operation takes us from one string to the other, but in the case of heterotic/heterotic duality and Type IIA/Type IIA duality this operation is a discrete symmetry of the theory. This Type IIA/Type IIA duality is discussed in [143] and we recognize this symmetry as subgroup of the $SO(5,5;Z)$ U-duality [13, 16, 144] of the $D = 6$ Type IIA string.

Vacua with $(N_+, N_-) = (1, 0)$ in $D = 6$ have been the subject of much interest lately. In addition to DMW vacua [141] discussed above, obtained from M-theory on $S^1/Z_2 \times K3$, there are also the GP vacua [165, 166, 167] obtained from the $SO(32)$ theory on $K3$ and the MV vacua [151, 152] obtained from *F-theory* [53] on Calabi-Yau. Indeed, all three categories are related by duality [145, 151, 148, 161, 150, 168, 152, 146]. In particular, the DMW heterotic strong/weak coupling duality gets mapped to a T-duality of the Type I version of the $SO(32)$ theory, and the non-perturbative gauge symmetries of the DMW model arise from small $Spin(32)/Z_2$ instantons in the heterotic version of the $SO(32)$ theory [168]. Because heterotic/heterotic duality interchanges worldsheet and spacetime loop expansions – or because it acts by duality on H – the duality exchanges the tree level Chern-Simons contributions to the Bianchi identity

$$dH = \alpha'(2\pi)^2 X_4$$
$$X_4 = \frac{1}{4(2\pi)^2}[\mathrm{tr}R^2 - \Sigma_\alpha v_\alpha \mathrm{tr}{F_\alpha}^2] \tag{6.11}$$

with the one-loop Green-Schwarz corrections to the field equations

$$d\tilde{H} = \alpha'(2\pi)^2 \tilde{X}_4$$
$$\tilde{X}_4 = \frac{1}{4(2\pi)^2}[\mathrm{tr}R^2 - \Sigma_\alpha \tilde{v}_\alpha \mathrm{tr}{F_\alpha}^2] \tag{6.12}$$

Here F_α is the field strength of the α^{th} component of the gauge group, tr denotes the trace in the fundamental representation, and $v_\alpha, \tilde{v}_\alpha$ are constants. (Without loss of generality, we may choose the string and dual string tensions to be equal [141].) In fact, the Green-Schwarz anomaly cancellation mechanism in six dimensions requires that the anomaly eight-form I_8 factorize as a product of four-forms,

$$I_8 = X_4 \tilde{X}_4, \tag{6.13}$$

and a six-dimensional string-string duality with the general features summarized above would exchange the two factors [133]. Moreover, supersymmetry relates the coefficients $v_\alpha, \tilde{v}_\alpha$ to the gauge field kinetic energy. In the Einstein metric $G^c{}_{MN} = e^{-\Phi/2} G_{MN}$, the exact dilaton dependence of the kinetic energy of the gauge field $F_{\alpha MN}$, is [160]

$$L_{gauge} = -\frac{(2\pi)^3}{8\alpha'} \sqrt{G^c} \Sigma_\alpha \left(v_\alpha e^{-\Phi/2} + \tilde{v}_\alpha e^{\Phi/2} \right) \mathrm{tr} F_{\alpha MN} F_\alpha{}^{MN}. \tag{6.14}$$

So whenever one of the $\tilde{v}_\alpha$ is negative, there is a value of the dilaton for which the coupling constant of the corresponding gauge group diverges. This is believed to signal a phase transition associated with the appearance of tensionless strings [154, 138, 155]. This does not happen for the symmetric embedding discussed above since the perturbative gauge fields have $v_\alpha > 0$ and $\tilde{v}_\alpha = 0$ and the non-perturbative gauge fields have $v_\alpha = 0$ and $\tilde{v}_\alpha > 0$. Another kind of heterotic/heterotic duality may arise, however, in vacua where one may Higgs away that subset of gauge fields with negative $\tilde{v}_\alpha$, and be left with gauge fields with $v_\alpha = \tilde{v}_\alpha > 0$. This happens for the non-symmetric embedding $k = 14$ and the appearance of non-perturbative gauge fields is not required [145, 146, 147, 151, 152]. Despite appearances, it known from F-theory that the $k = 12$ and $k = 14$ models are actually equivalent [151, 152].

Vacua with $(N_+, N_-) = (2, 0)$ arising from Type IIB on $K3$ also have an M-theoretic description, in terms of compactification on T^5/Z_2 [153, 164].

6.2 Four dimensions

It is interesting to consider further toroidal compactification to four dimensions, replacing R^6 by $R^4 \times T^2$. Starting with a $K3$ vacuum in which the $E_8 \times E_8$ gauge symmetry is completely Higgsed, the toroidal compactification to four dimensions gives an $N = 2$ theory with the usual three vector multiplets S, T and U related to the four-dimensional heterotic string coupling constant and the area and shape of the T^2. When reduced to four dimensions, the six-dimensional string-string duality (6.10) becomes [65] an operation that exchanges S and T, so in the case of heterotic/heterotic duality we have a discrete $S - T$ interchange symmetry. This self-duality of heterotic string vacua does not rule out the the possibility that in $D = 4$ they are also dual to Type IIA strings compactified on Calabi-Yau manifolds. In fact, as discussed in [157], when the gauge group is completely Higgsed, obvious candidates are provided by Calabi-Yau manifolds with hodge numbers $h_{11} = 3$ and $h_{21} = 243$, since these have the same massless field content. Moreover, these manifolds do indeed exhibit

the $S-T$ interchange symmetry [156, 28, 158]. Since the heterotic string on $T^2 \times K3$ also has R to $1/R$ symmetries that exchange T and U, one might expect a complete $S-T-U$ triality symmetry, as discussed in [163]. In all known models, however, the $T-U$ interchange symmetry is spoiled by non-perturbative effects [159, 162].

An interesting aspect of the Calabi-Yau manifolds X appearing in the duality between heterotic strings on $K3 \times T^2$ and Type IIA strings on X, is that they can always be written in the form of a $K3$ fibration [156, 149]. Once again, this ubiquity of $K3$ is presumably a consequence of the interpretation of the heterotic string as the $K3$ wrapping of a fivebrane. Consequently, if X admits *two* different $K3$ fibrations, this would provide an alternative explanation for heterotic dual pairs in four dimensions [148, 151, 152, 149] and this is indeed the case for the Calabi-Yau manifolds discussed above.

Acknowledgements

I have enjoyed valuable conversations with my colleagues at Texas A&M: Hong Lu, Jian Xin Lu, Sudipta Mukherji, Bengt Nilsson, Chris Pope, Ergin Sezgin and Per Sundell.

References

[1] P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. Roy. Soc. **A268** (1962) 57.

[2] J. Hughes, J. Liu and J. Polchinski, *Supermembranes*, Phys.Lett. **180B** (1986) 370.

[3] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and P. Townsend, *Supermembranes and eleven-dimensional supergravity*, Phys.Lett.**B189** (1987) 75.

[4] M. B. Green and J. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **B136** (1984) 367.

[5] M. J. Duff, *Kaluza-Klein theory in perspective*, in the Proceedings of the Nobel Symposium *Oskar Klein Centenary*, Stockholm, September 1994, (Ed Lindstrom, World Scientific 1995), NI-94-015, CTP-TAMU-22/94, hep-th/9410046.

[6] M. J. Duff, B. E. W. Nilsson and C. N. Pope, *Kaluza-Klein supergravity*, Phys. Rep. **130** (1986) 1.

[7] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and P. Townsend, *Properties of the eleven-dimensional super membrane theory*, Ann.Phys. **185** (1988) 330.

[8] E. Cremmer, B. Julia and J. Scherk, *Supergravity in theory in* 11 *dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **76B** (1978) 409.

[9] B. Julia, in *Proceedings of the 2nd Marcel Grossman meeting*, Trieste (1979).

[10] A. Achucarro, J. Evans, P. Townsend and D. Wiltshire, *Super p-branes*, Phys.Lett. **198B** (1987) 441.

[11] M. Duff, P. Howe, T. Inami and K. Stelle, *Superstrings in $d = 10$ from supermembranes in $d = 11$*, Phys.Lett. **191B** (1987) 70.

[12] J. Polchinski, *Dirichlet-branes and Ramond-Ramond charges*, Phys.Rev.Lett. **75** (1995) 4724.

[13] M. J. Duff and J. Lu, *Duality rotations in membrane theory*, Nucl.Phys. **B347** (1990) 394.

[14] M. J. Duff, J. T. Liu and R. Minasian, *Eleven-dimensional origin of string/string duality: A one loop test*, Nucl.Phys. **B452** (1995) 261.

[15] K. Becker, M. Becker and A. Strominger, *Fivebranes, membranes and nonperturbative string theory*, Nucl.Phys. **B456** (1995) 130.

[16] C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, *Unity of superstring dualities*, Nucl. Phys. **B438** (1995) 109.

[17] P. Townsend, *The eleven-dimensional supermembrane revisited*, Phys.Lett.**B350** (1995) 184.

[18] E. Witten, *String theory dynamics in various dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B443** (1995) 85.

[19] J. H. Schwarz, *The power of M-theory*, Phys. Lett. **B360** (1995) 13.

[20] O. Aharony, J. Sonnenschein and S. Yankielowicz, *Interactions of strings and D-branes from M-theory*, `hep-th/9603009`.

[21] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker and L. Susskind, *M theory as a matrix model: a conjecture*, hep-th/9610043.

[22] J. G. Russo, hep-th/9610018.

[23] J. G. Russo and A. Tseytlin, hep-th/9611047.

[24] M. J. Duff, *Supermembranes: The first fifteen weeks*, Class. Quant. Grav. **5** (1988) 189.

[25] M. J. Duff, *Classical and quantum supermembranes*, Class. Quant. Grav. **6** (1989) 1577.

[26] M. J. Duff, C. N. Pope and E. Sezgin, *Supermembranes and Physics in 2 + 1 Dimensions*, Proceedings of the supermembrane workshop, ICTP, Trieste, July 1989 (World Scientific, 1990).

[27] M. J. Duff, R. R. Khuri and J. X. Lu, *String solitons*, Phys. Rep. **259** (1995) 213.

[28] M. J. Duff, *Electric/magnetic duality and its stringy origins*, I. J. M. P. **A11** (1996) 4031.

[29] M. J. Duff, *M-theory (the theory formerly known as strings)*, hep-th/9608117, to appear in I. J. M. P **A**.

[30] P. K. Townsend, *Recent Problems in Mathematical Physics*, Proceedings of the 13th GIFT Seminar on Theoretical Physics: Salamanca, Spain, 15-27 June, 1992.

[31] J. Polchinski, *TASI lectures on D-branes*, hep-th/9611050.

[32] J. H. Schwarz, *Lectures on Superstring and M-theory dualities*, hep-th/9607201.

[33] Y. Nambu, *Lectures at the Copenhagen conference, 1970.*

[34] T. Goto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **46** (1971) 1560.

[35] P. S. Howe and R. W. Tucker, J. Phys. **A10** (1987) L155.

[36] A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **103B** (1981) 207, 211.

[37] S. Deser, M. J. Duff and C. J. Isham, *Finite energy static solutions to chiral models in three space dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B114**, 29 (1976).

[38] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and P. Townsend, Phys.Lett. **B209** (1988) 451.

[39] M. J. Duff, T. Inami, C. N. Pope, E. Sezgin and K. S. Stelle, *Semiclassical quantization of the supermembrane*, Nucl.Phys. **B297** (1988) 515.

[40] U. Lindstrom and M. Rocek, ITP-SB-88-61.

[41] P. S. Howe and E. Sezgin, *Superbranes*, `hep-th/9607227`.

[42] P. S. Howe and E. Sezgin, $D = 11$, $p = 5$, `hep-th/9611008`.

[43] W. Siegel, Phys. Lett. **B128** (1983) 397.

[44] G. Sierra, Class, Quantum. Grav. **4** (1987) 227.

[45] J. M. Evans, Nucl. Phys. **B298** (1988) 92.

[46] J. Strathdee, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A2** (1987) 273.

[47] M. Blencowe and M. J. Duff, *Supermembranes and the signature of space-time*, Nucl.Phys. **B310** (1988) 387.

[48] T. Kugo and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1983) 387.

[49] P. Van Nieuwenhuizen, in *Relativity, Groups and Topology*, eds. DeWitt and Stora, North Holland (1983).

[50] R. Coqueraux, Phys. Lett. **B115** (1982) 389.

[51] P. G. O. Freund, *Introduction to Supersymmetry*, C. U. P. (1986).

[52] J. W. van Holten and A. van Proyen, J. Phys. **A15** (1982) 3763.

[53] C. Vafa, *Evidence for F-theory*, `hep-th/9602022`.

[54] C. Schmidhuber, *D-brane actions*, Nucl. Phys. **B467** (1996) 146.

[55] J. Hoppe, Aachen preprint PITHA 86/24.

[56] E. Floratos and J. Illiopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B201** 91988) 237.

[57] B. DeWit, J. Hoppe and H. Nicolai, Nucl. Phys. **B305** (1988) 545.

[58] A. H. Chamseddine, Phys. Rev. **D24** (1981) 3065.

[59] E. A. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, B. de Wit and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Nucl. Phys. **B195** (1982) 97.

[60] G. F. Chapline and N. S. Manton, Phys. Lett. **B120** (1983) 105.

[61] S. J. Gates and H. Nishino, Phys. Lett. **B157** (1985) 157.

[62] A. Salam and E. Sezgin, Physica Scripta **32** (1985) 283.

[63] M. J. Duff and J. X. Lu, *Black and super p-branes in diverse dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B416** (1994) 301.

[64] E. Bergshoeff, M. J. Duff, C. N. Pope and E. Sezgin , *Compactifications of the eleven-dimensional supermembrane*, Phys. Lett. **B176** (1987) 69.

[65] M. J. Duff, *Strong/weak coupling duality from the dual string*, Nucl. Phys. **B442** (1995) 47.

[66] H. Nishino and E. Sezgin, *Supersymmetric Yang-Mills equations in* $10 + 2$ *dimensions*, `hep-th/9607185`.

[67] A. Sen, *F-theory and orientifolds*, `hep-th/9605150`.

[68] C. G. Callan, J. A. Harvey and A. Strominger, *World sheet approach to heterotic instantons and solitons*, Nucl.Phys. **B359** (1991) 611.

[69] C. G. Callan, J. A. Harvey and A. Strominger, *Worldbrane actions for string solitons*, Nucl.Phys.**B367** (1991) 60.

[70] M. J. Duff and J. X. Lu, *The self-dual Type IIB superthreebrane*, Phys. Lett. **B273** (1991) 409.

[71] R. Gueven, *Black p-brane solutions of* $D = 11$ *supergravity theory*, Phys.Lett. **B276** (1992) 49.

[72] M. J. Duff and J. X. Lu, *Type II p-branes: the brane scan revisited*, Nucl. Phys. **B390** (1993) 276.

[73] J. Dai, R. G. Leigh and J. Polchinski, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A4** (1989) 2073.

[74] L. Romans, *Massive $N = 2a$ supergravity in ten dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **B169** (1986) 374.

[75] E. Witten, *Bound states of strings and p-branes*, Nucl.Phys. **B460** (1996) 335.

[76] M. R. Douglas, *Branes within branes*, `hep-th/9512077`.

[77] M. J. Duff and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Quantum inequivalence of different field representations*, Phys. Lett. **B94** (1980) 179.

[78] A. Aurelia, H. Nicolai and P. K. Townsend, *Hidden constants: the theta parameter of QCD and the cosmological constants of $N = 8$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B176** (1980) 509.

[79] M. J. Duff, R. R. Khuri, R. Minasian and J. Rahmfeld, *New black hole, string and membrane solutions of the four-dimensional heterotic string*, Nucl. Phys. **B418** (1994) 195.

[80] E. Bergshoeff, M.B. Green, G. Papadopoulos, P.K. Townsend, *The IIA supereightbrane*, `hep-th/9511079`

[81] Gary W. Gibbons, Michael B. Green, Malcolm J. Perry, *Instantons and seven-branes in Type IIB superstring theory*, `hep-th/9511080`

[82] R. G. Leigh, *Dirac-Born-Infeld action from Dirichlet sigma model*, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A4** (1989) 2767.

[83] M. Cederwall, A. von Gussich, A. Mikovic, B. E. W. Nilsson and A. Westerberg, *On the Dirac-Born-Infeld action for D-branes*, `hep-th/9606173`

[84] M. Cederwall, A. von Gussich, B. E. W. Nilsson and A. Westerberg, *The Dirichlet superthreebrane in ten dimensional Type IIB supergravity*, `hep-th/9610148`

[85] M. Aganagic, C. Popescu and J. S. Schwarz, *D-brane actions with local kappa symmetry action*, `hep-th/9610249`

[86] E. Bergshoeff and P. K. Townsend, *Super D-branes*, `hep-th/9611173`

[87] I. Bars, C. N. Pope and E. Sezgin, *Massless spectrum and critical dimension of the supermembrane*, Phys.Lett. **198B** (1987) 455.

[88] I. Bars, UC-87/HEP06, Ste.Adele Grp.Theor.1988:693-698 (QC20:C56:1988)

[89] I. Bars and C. N. Pope, Class. Quantum Grav. **5** (1988) 1157.

[90] B. DeWit, M. Luscher and H. Nicolai, Nucl. Phys. **B320** (1989) 135.

[91] P. Townsend, *D-branes from M-branes*, `hep-th/9512062`.

[92] M. Cederwall, A. von Gussich, B. E. W. Nilsson, P. Sundell and A. Westerberg, *The Dirichlet super p-branes in ten-dimensional Type IIA and Type IIB supergravity*, `hep-th/9611159`.

[93] P. Horava and E. Witten, *Heterotic and Type I string dynamics from eleven dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B460** (1996) 506.

[94] G. Papadopoulos and P. K. Townsend, *Kaluza-Klein on the Brane*, `hep-th/9609095`.

[95] S. Coleman, *Classical Lumps and Their Quantum Descendants*, *New Phenomena in Subnuclear Physics*, ed A. Zichichi (Plenum, New York, 1976).

[96] R. Jackiw, Rev. Mod. Phys. **49** (1977) 681.

[97] M. B. Hindmarsh and T. W. B. Kibble, SUSX-TP-94-74, IMPERIAL/TP/94-95/5, NI 94025, hep-ph/9411342.

[98] R. Rajaraman, *Solitons and Instantons*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.

[99] A. Vilenkin and E. P. Shellard, *Cosmic String and Other Topological Defects*, (Cambridge University Press, 1994).

[100] C. Montonen and D. Olive, Phys. Lett. **B72** (1977) 117.

[101] A. Dabholkar, G. W. Gibbons, J. A. Harvey and F. Ruiz Ruiz, Nucl. Phys. **B340** (1990) 33.

[102] R. I. Nepomechie, *Magnetic monopoles from antisymmetric tensor gauge fields*, Phys. Rev. **D31** (1985) 1921.

[103] C. Teitelboim, *Monopoles of higher rank*, Phys. Lett. **B167** (1986) 63.

[104] H. Nicolai, P. K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Lett. Nuovo Cimento **30** (1981) 315.

[105] G. T. Horowitz and A. Strominger, *Black strings and p-branes*, Nucl.Phys. **B360** (1991) 197.

[106] M. J. Duff and J. Rahmfeld, *Massive string states as extreme black holes*, Phys. Lett. **B345** (1995) 441.

[107] M. J. Duff, H. Lu and C. N. Pope, *The black branes of M-theory*, Phys. Lett. **B382** (1996) 73.

[108] B. R. Greene, D. R. Morrison and A. Strominger, *Black hole condensation and the unification of string vacua*, CLNS-95/1335, `hep-th/9504145`.

[109] A. Strominger and C. Vafa, *Microscopic origin of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy*, `hep-th/9601029`.

[110] A. Strominger, *Open p-branes*, `hep-th/9512059`.

[111] G. Papadopoulos and P. K. Townsend, *Intersecting M-branes*, `hep-th/9603087`

[112] I. R. Klebanov and A. A. Tseytlin, *Intersecting M-branes as four-dimensional black holes*, `hep-th/9604166`.

[113] K. Behrndt, E. Bergshoeff and B. Janssen, *Intersecting D-branes in ten and six dimensions*, `hep-th/9604168`.

[114] J. Gauntlett, D. Kastor and J. Transchen, *Overlapping branes in M-theory*, `hep-th/9604179`.

[115] M. J. Duff and K. Stelle, *Multimembrane solutions of d = 11 supergravity*, Phys.Lett. **B253** (1991) 113.

[116] G. W. Gibbons and P. K. Townsend, *Vacuum interpolation in supergravity via super p-branes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993) 3754.

[117] V. Balasubramanian and F. Larsen, *On D-branes and black holes in four dimensions* hep-th/9604189

[118] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo and T. Ortin, *The eleven-dimensional five-brane*, hep-th/9606118.

[119] M. J. Duff and J. X. Lu, *Elementary fivebrane solutions of $D = 10$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B354** (1991) 141.

[120] S. P. De Alwis, *A note on brane tension and M-theory*, hep-th/9607011.

[121] H. Lu, C. N. Pope, E. Sezgin and K. S. Stelle, *Stainless super p-branes*, hep-th/9508042.

[122] H. Lu and C. N. Pope, *p-brane solitons in maximal supergravities*, Nucl.Phys. **B465** (1996) 127.

[123] P. Townsend, *Supersymmetric extended solitons*, Phys.Lett. **B202** (1988) 53.

[124] M. J. Duff, G. W. Gibbons and P. K. Townsend, *Macroscopic Superstrings as Interpolating Solitons*, Phys. Lett. **B332** (1994) 321.

[125] A. Strominger, *Heterotic solitons*, Nucl.Phys. **B343** (1990) 167.

[126] C. M. Hull, *String dynamics at strong coupling*, Nucl.Phys. **B468** (1996) 113.

[127] A. Sen, *Dyon-monopole bound states, self-dual harmonic forms on the multi-monoploe moduli space and SL(2,Z) invariance in string theory*, hep-th/9402032.

[128] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Electric/magnetic duality, monopole condensation and confinement in N=2 supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory*, RU-94-52, IAS-94-43, hep-th/9407087.

[129] M. J. Duff and J. X. Lu, *Remarks on string/fivebrane duality*, Nucl. Phys. **B354** (1991) 141.

[130] M. J. Duff and J. X. Lu, *Strings from fivebranes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 1402.

[131] M. J. Duff and J. X. Lu, *Loop expansions and string/five-brane duality*, Nucl. Phys. **B357** (1991) 534.

[132] M. J. Duff and R. R. Khuri, *Four-dimensional string/string duality*, Nucl. Phys. **B411** (1994) 473.

[133] M. J. Duff and R. Minasian, *Putting string/string duality to the test*, Nucl. Phys. **B436** (1995) 507.

[134] A. Sen, *String string duality conjecture in six dimensions and charged solitonic strings*, `hep-th/9504027`.

[135] J. A. Harvey and A. Strominger, *The heterotic string is a soliton*, Nucl. Phys. **B449** (1995) 535.

[136] A. Font, L. Ibanez, D. Lust and F. Quevedo, *Strong-weak coupling duality and non-perturbative effects in string theory*, Phys. Lett. **B249** (1990) 35.

[137] S.-J. Rey, *The confining phase of superstrings and axionic strings*, Phys. Rev. **D43** (1991) 526.

[138] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Comments on string dynamics in six dimensions*, `hep-th/9603003`.

[139] E. Witten, *Strong coupling expansion of Calabi-Yau compactification*, Nucl.Phys. **B471** (1996) 135.

[140] E. Witten, *On flux quantization in M theory and the effective action*, `hep-th/9609122`.

[141] M. J. Duff, R. Minasian and E. Witten, *Evidence for heterotic/heterotic duality*, Nucl. Phys. **B465** (1996) 413.

[142] P. Townsend, *D-Branes From M-Branes*, Phys. Lett. **B373** (1996) 68.

[143] A. Sen and C. Vafa, *Dual pairs of Type IIA string compactifications*, Nucl. Phys. **B455** (1995) 165.

[144] R. Dijkgraaf, E. Verlinde and H. Verlinde, *BPS quantization of the five-brane*, `hep-th/9604055`.

[145] G. Aldazabal, A. Font, L. E. Ibanez and F. Quevado, *Heterotic/heterotic duality in $D = 6, 4$*, Phys. Lett. **B380** (1996) 42.

[146] G. Aldazabal, A. Font, L. E. Ibanez and A. M. Uranga, *New branches of string compactifications and their F-theory duals*, hep-th/9607121.

[147] E. Gimon and C. V. Johnson, *Multiple realisations of $N = 1$ vacua in six dimensions*, hep-th/9606176.

[148] P. S. Aspinwall and M. Gross, *Heterotic-heterotic string duality and multiple $K3$ fibrations*, hep-th/9602118.

[149] P. S. Aspinwall , *$K3$ surfaces and String Duality*, hep-th/9611137.

[150] S. Ferrara, R. Minasian and A. Sagnotti, *Low-energy analysis of M and F theories on Calabi-Yau manifolds*, hep-th/9604097.

[151] D. R. Morrison and C. Vafa, *Compactifications of F-theory on Calabi-Yau threefolds-I*, hep-th/9602114.

[152] D. R. Morrison and C. Vafa, *Compactifications of F-theory on Calabi-Yau threefolds-II*, hep-th/9603161.

[153] K. Dasgupta and S. Mukhi, *Orbifolds of M-theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B465** (1996) 399.

[154] O. J. Ganor and A. Hanany, *Small E_8 instantons and tensionless non-critical strings*, hep-th/9603003.

[155] M. J. Duff, H. Lu and C. N. Pope, *Heterotic phase transitions and singularities of the gauge dyonic string*, hep-th/9603037.

[156] A. Klemm, W. Lerche and P. Mayr, *K3-fibrations and heterotic-Type-II duality*, hep-th/9506112.

[157] S. Kachru and C. Vafa, *Exact results for N=2 compactifications of heterotic strings*, hep-th/9505105.

[158] G. Lopez Cardoso, D. Lust and T. Mohaupt, *Non-perturbative monodromies in N=2 heterotic string vacua*, hep-th/9504090.

[159] J. Louis, J. Sonnenschein, S. Theisen and S. Yankielowicz, *Non-perturbative properties of heterotic string vacua compactified on $K3 \times T^2$*, hep-th/9606049.

[160] A. Sagnotti, *A note on the Green-Schwarz mechanism in open-string theories*, Phys. Lett. **B294** (1992) 196.

[161] E. Witten, *Phase transitions in M-theory and F-theory*, `hep-th/9603150`.

[162] G. Lopez Cardoso, G. Curio, D. Lust and T. Mohaupt, *Instanton numbers and exchange symmetries in $N = 2$ dual string pairs*, `hep-th/9603108`.

[163] M. J. Duff, J.T. Liu and J. Rahmfeld, *Four-dimensional string/string/string triality*, Nucl. Phys. **B459** (1996) 125.

[164] E. Witten, *Fivebranes and M-theory on an orbifold*, Nucl. Phys. **B463** (1996) 383.

[165] G. Pradisi and A. Sagnotti, *Open string Orbifolds*, Phys. Lett. **B216** (1989) 59.

[166] M. Bianchi and A. Sagnotti, *Twist symmetry and open string Wilson lines*, Nucl. Phys. **B361** (1991) 519.

[167] E. G. Gimon and J. Polchinski, *Consistency conditions for orientifolds and D-manifolds*, Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 1667.

[168] M. Berkooz, R. G. Leigh, J. Polchinski, J. H. Schwarz, N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Anomalies, dualities and topology of $D = 6$ $N = 1$ superstring vacua*, `hep-th/9605184`.

[169] A. Giveon, M. Porrati and E. Rabinovici, *Target space duality in string theory*, Phys. Rep. **244** (1994) 77.